

020.7 R32c

Reece	\$3.00
The Curriculum in	
Library Schools	
Acc. No.	93107
D. H. H. - 1	

020.7 R32c

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2¢ a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.

0001 0251820 6

DF 11-37

76 JA '38 45

74F-38

19 Feb '68

27 No. 2

17 Oc'39

in 62237

'PR 19'47

~~JUN 7 '47 - 70~~

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN LIBRARY SERVICE

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

CHARLES C. WILLIAMSON, *chairman*
Dean, School of Library Service and Director of University
Libraries, Columbia University

To serve until October 1, 1936

CHARLES H. BROWN, Librarian, Iowa State College
REBECCA B. RANKIN, Librarian, Municipal Reference Library, New York
PAUL NORTH RICE, Director of Libraries, New York University

To serve until October 1, 1937

LESLIE E. BLISS, Librarian, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San
Marino, Calif.
LUCY E. FAY, Associate Professor of Library Service, Columbia University
PHINEAS L. WINDSOR, Librarian of the University and Director of the Library
School, University of Illinois

To serve until October 1, 1938

CHARLES H. COMPTON, Assistant Librarian, St. Louis Public Library
H. M. LYDENBERG, Director, The New York Public Library
ERNEST J. REECE, Professor of Library Service, Columbia University
HENRY B. VAN HOESEN, Librarian, Brown University

IV

THE CURRICULUM IN LIBRARY SCHOOLS

THE CURRICULUM IN LIBRARY SCHOOLS

BY

ERNEST J. REECE

PROFESSOR OF LIBRARY SERVICE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



NEW YORK: MORNINGSIDE HEIGHTS
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

1936

COPYRIGHT 1936
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED 1936

FOREIGN AGENTS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
HUMPHREY MILFORD, AMEN HOUSE
LONDON, E.C.4, ENGLAND

KWANG HSUEH PUBLISHING HOUSE
140 PEKING ROAD
SHANGHAI, CHINA

MARUZEN COMPANY, LTD.
6 NIHONBASHI, TORI-NICHOME
TOKYO, JAPAN

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
B. I. BUILDING, NICOL ROAD
BOMBAY, INDIA

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PREFACE

THIS volume agrees that systematized preparation for library service merits a place in American professional education. Such a view seems supported by the facts regarding library work set forth in the several chapters, and not less by the occurrence in library schools of the procedures and problems which arise in the formal qualifying of physicians, lawyers, engineers, social workers, teachers, and ministers.

The primary aim is to present those considerations, touching the curriculum in library schools, which have import for students contemplating instructional positions in such schools. Questions of teaching and of administration are left for other treatment, except as reference to them is involved in dealing with the curriculum.

Acknowledgments are due to the *Library Quarterly* for permission to reprint sections of two articles. I am indebted to Sabra S. Reece, my wife, for numerous criticisms, for assistance of various kinds on the manuscript, and for preparation of the index.

The citations throughout the text are to the numbered references beginning on page 191.

ERNEST J. REECE

SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SERVICE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
SEPTEMBER 1, 1936

CONTENTS

I. WHAT LIBRARY WORK HAS BEEN	I
Relation of the calling to preparation for it.—Early insignificance and obscurity of library work.—Later enhancement.—Present scope.—Elements common to its various parts.—Hindrances to development.	
II. WHAT LIBRARY WORK IS BECOMING	13
Continuing growth.—Clarification and effectuating of aims.—Possible definition.—New media and bases for service.—Increased efficiency.—Improved organization.—Departmentalizing and stratifying.—Codifying of practice.—Authoritative terminology.—Co-ordination among libraries.—Adjustment to constituencies.—Use of resources in other fields.—Investigational procedures.—Effects of developments upon personnel.—Relation to other callings.—Professional status.	
III. BEGINNINGS OF THE CURRICULUM	28
Historical sources.—The four early schools.—Purposes of the founders.—Practical emphasis.—Procedures in building the curriculum.—Specific components.—Length.—Form.—Training, apprentice, and summer classes.	
IV. GROWTH OF THE CURRICULUM	41
Increase in number of schools.—Influence of committees, librarians, surveys, faculties, tradition.—Earliest changes in content of the curriculum.—Attainment of a basic outline.—Retirement of some topics.—Elaboration of others.—Modifications due to new conditions.—Added items.—Length.—Organization.—Continuance of training and apprentice classes.—Spread of summer schools.—Other undertakings.—Solidarity of the curriculum.	
V. OUTLINES OF THE CURRICULUM	59
Value of a framework.—Procedures in libraries as a basis.—Derivation of an instructional inventory from these activ-	

ities.—Impracticability of omissions.—Suggested additions.—Liberal studies.—Peripheral subjects.—Potential expansion of the curriculum.

VI. ADAPTING THE CURRICULUM 72

Field to be served.—Level of work contemplated.—Choice between functional and systematic organization.—Logical versus psychological arrangement.—Content.—Detailing of items.—Length.—Internal proportioning.—Interrelation of elements.—Sequence.—Classification.—Courses.—Terminology.—Co-ordination of subjects.—Compromise in shaping the curriculum.—Uniformity among schools.—Sources of facts and suggestions.—Influence of field conditions.—Liberal approach.

VII. VARIATIONS, EXTENSIONS, AND ABRIDGMENTS . . . 95

Departures from the basic curriculum.—Variations.—Forms directed to particular types of library work.—Elective plans.—Extensions.—Growth of the extensions.—Instructional matter contributing to them.—Topics germane to the basic curriculum.—Academic and technical subjects from other fields.—Arguments against extensions.—Reasons for extensions.—Possible abridgments of the curriculum.—Substitutions.—New proposals.

VIII. SUPPLEMENTS TO THE CURRICULUM 121

Incompleteness of formal instruction.—Work contacts.—Importance.—Types.—Use.—Place of field work.—Experience of library schools with field work.—Conditions for success.—Student guidance.—Kinds relevant in library schools.—Devices and organization of student guidance.

IX. WHERE THE CURRICULUM BELONGS 137

Academic level.—Practice to date.—Action by Board of Education for Librarianship.—Criteria which should govern.—Preliminary education required by library work.—Character of curriculum matter.—Accidental factors.—First graduate year as a solution.—Affiliations of the curriculum.—Arrangements used.—Gains of association with universities.—Possible losses.—Indispensability for extensions of the curriculum.—Connection with teachers' colleges.

CONTENTS

ix

X. THE CURRICULUM IN PERSPECTIVE 155

Distinction between training and education.—Meaning for the curriculum.—Aims of the teaching.—Imparting knowledge.—Inculcating skills.—Developing traits.—The degree of finish desirable in the curriculum.—Responsiveness to the field.—Leadership.—Concern of library schools with recruiting, selecting, measuring, accrediting, placing, apprenticing.—Teaching as the first charge.

XI. CONDITIONS FOR THE CURRICULUM 173

Competent teaching.—Selection of staff.—Working conditions for a faculty.—Controlling and advancing standards.—Material resources and equipment.—Suitable student body.—Relation of this to field conditions and curriculum.—Entrance requirements.—Liberal education.—Appropriate personal qualities.—Experience in libraries.—Power of rejection.

REFERENCES 189

INDEX 213

THE CURRICULUM
IN
LIBRARY SCHOOLS

I

WHAT LIBRARY WORK HAS BEEN

THE occasion for careful scrutiny of a vocation in considering the preparation for it is too obvious to require argument. Such examination is vital to aspirants for the calling and to their advisers, even though often neglected; it is indispensable to administrators and faculties who, through responsibility for programs of study and experience, must command the approval of students, of practitioners, of employers, and of sponsoring and appropriating bodies; it is fundamental to teachers in the shaping of their instruction and in the choice, organization, and presentation of matter to classes.

Library work furnishes no exception; the only question is what and how much can be done profitably by way of canvassing its conditions. Elsewhere in this volume is emphasized the part which tangible fact and objective evidence might play, but so far have not played, in supplying firm groundwork for the instruction of prospective librarians. Until such knowledge is at hand confident footing is hardly to be anticipated. At the same time, discovery seems unlikely to alter the basic functions and activities for which libraries have stood, or alone to shape their general character for the future. Some review of what is accepted and expected regarding them therefore is rudimentary in any discussion of the curriculum in library schools. Since the qualifying of personnel is the purpose of the curriculum, such a summary may well be put as far as possible in terms of the duties falling to the staffs of libraries.

Much has been written regarding the development of

libraries in ancient, medieval, and modern times, but relatively little about the work of the librarian. Librarians themselves seem partly responsible for this, having left few personal records and scant official reports. On the other hand, the fact that one of the most compendious treatments of library history carries the title "the care of books,"^a and yet largely ignores the caretakers, typifies the attitude toward book collections and their oversight which commonly has obtained. For reasons easy to understand neither the general public nor the scholarly world has regarded the custody of books as more than a routine matter, or the usefulness of books as depending upon anything but the knowledge and initiative of readers; whereas the few individual librarians who have drawn wide attention to themselves have done so for the most part by reason of activities and attainments not necessarily associated with their book collections. There have been possible exceptions to this, such as Magliabecchi, founder of the National Central Library at Florence, and Naudé, whose obsessive assembling of books gave Paris a public library in the seventeenth century; but history reserves a larger place for Thomas of Sarzana as Pope Nicholas the Fifth than as Cosimo de' Medici's librarian, or even as a builder of the Vatican library, and honors Richard Bentley as a contributor to a new type of scholarship rather than as a one-time keeper of the English Royal Library. This is not to underrate such quiet but telling work as that of Van Praet at the Bibliothèque Nationale, of John Winter Jones at the British Museum, and of Spofford at the Library of Congress; but to point out that it has brought little recognition beyond bibliographical circles. Throughout the centuries the features of library work and the personal qualities which have tended to make a librarian of a given

^a See reference 104. The word "reference" (hereafter abbreviated to "ref.") alludes to the items in the list on pages 191-211.

individual seemingly have acted likewise to fend the mantle of fame from his shoulders.

Library work in any country previous to the nineteenth century would seem to have necessitated, as a rule, few qualifications that an educated man would not possess or that would call for a peculiar novitiate. Although a candidate for it might find his path to appointment rough unless he had established a reputation for scholarship, this was hardly because of demands regarded as inherent in the work itself; little was expected but to keep the stock in some semblance of order, to maintain a simple record of holdings, and to safeguard the conditions of use. The librarian who displayed zeal or skill in acquisition might indeed be vested with responsibilities befitting this gift, witness Platina at the Vatican and Lambeck at Vienna; or one apt in the organizing of knowledge might find expression for his talents in the compilation of a catalogue, as did Nicolas Clément at the French Royal Library, or in aid to readers, as did Van Praet. Such men were exceptions, however, the collecting function commonly being retained by the patron or proprietor, and efforts to give service not being expected. Even when a librarian was versed in the subject matter of his treasures or in the materials and methods involved in the production of books and manuscripts, he might be left largely to his own designs in study and writing, such activities being viewed as gracing his position, even if extraneous to it. There is little to suggest that the precepts on librarianship formulated by John Dury ^b about 1650 and by Cotton des Houssayes ^c in 1780 came to any general acceptance before 1800. The early conception of the librarian's duties therefore survived the days when princes, prelates, and individuals of private fortune were the chief possessors of books, and persisted after community interest in book collections began to be recognized.

^b See ref. 165.

^c See ref. 132.

In the absence of explicit records it is to be inferred that the mere growth of libraries open more or less to the public, which became marked after 1800, rendered the duties of librarians somewhat more exacting. As time added to the number of volumes and equally to their value, naturally the collections called for greater care in organization, and larger numbers of people wished to use them. The handling of accessions and the making of catalogues, accordingly, must have become more formidable tasks, each forcing the development of new techniques and doubtless claiming in some cases the undivided labor of individuals; and the need for supervision, which had had no place in small, closed, private libraries, must have become apparent as the right of access was established more widely. Out of it all began to evolve codes and devices, rules and privileges, barriers and open areas; and gradually requests for new services, with whatever of fresh responsibility was implied thereby. Individual librarians might disregard this and continue to indulge their taste for study or even their sloth; but obviously there had to be on the staff of each growing library those who could deal with the increasingly insistent demands.

In the early days of librarianship in the United States probably little was added to the librarian's tasks as these had evolved in other countries. The collections of books about which the colleges grew were small, occupied slight space, required scant oversight, and were likely to be in charge only of a professor, perhaps with the help of a student. Those maintained by associations on a proprietary or subscription basis probably were at the outset just as casually conducted. The aim chiefly was to get and hold together a handful of titles for study purposes on the one hand, and as a means of passing around intellectual benefits on the other. If the books had to be listed and if notations showing the whereabouts of borrowed volumes needed to be kept,

this could be done in the simplest fashion. The care of funds was not a great problem, and there was no staff to organize and direct. The somewhat communal attitude which prevailed among users, coupled with respect for the printed word, reduced the need both for guidance and for safeguards. Only as the college libraries and a few of the proprietary libraries attained large size was there occasion for more management; and by the time this occurred the public library was on the scene and leading the way, both in the United States and elsewhere, to the recognition of library work as entailing express responsibilities.

What had to come before library work could be distinguished from other activities concerned with books, and consequently before it could be defined, was the realization that it is both intermediary and active. While remaining hospitable always to such germane literary and historical labors as those of Zenodotus at Alexandria, of Cardinal Mai at Milan and at the Vatican, and of Bradshaw at Cambridge, it required to be viewed as dealing predominantly with the management and utilization of book resources; so that its full outlines could be drawn only by men like Edwards and Panizzi in England and later by Dewey and Putnam in the United States. Briefly, the librarian need not discover knowledge nor create books, and his major reason for existence is that his efforts make the content of books more available and operative than otherwise it would be. Far from narrowing his function, this description has proved usually more sufficient to his work than have his resources. No limits are easily set upon his endeavors when he is called upon, after assembling books, to preserve them, to arrange them, to offer them to readers, and even to interpret them—all with reference to an ascertained want. The boundaries are still more difficult to fix when the multifarious processes which fall to the librarian to perform or oversee are reviewed

in detail. The definition has widened as it has become established; its particulars and its full meaning can be grasped only by examining some of the important forms of library work.

In all the developments which in the last century have given library work its present character the public library, particularly in the English-speaking world, has been the chief contributor. While its beginnings were as modest as those of the private, institutional, state, and proprietary libraries already mentioned, it has been conspicuous both as originator and adapter, and unquestionably is the most fruitful point, although not the only place, to seek the practical elements which should govern preparation for library work. It looks in many directions, provides a wide variety of services, shelves an unlimited range of matter, recruits workers of diverse gifts, and grapples with major problems of education and social welfare. The activities of its staffs appear in the aggregate to be a miscellany, although so only when viewed without relation to their common end. The head of a public library, or he and his associates, must select books with reference to their content, authority, permanence, and cost, and with regard to the clientele concerned and to the housing available; and he must buy them advantageously, subject to the routines necessary in a specialized purchasing office. He must place the books acquired in a classification scheme and list them in a catalogue, each of which processes calls alike for an educated intelligence and for facility and sense of proportion in handling minutiae; and he must maintain records as to their whereabouts—not so much to safeguard them as to assure their accessibility when needed. He must arrange for their display and provide as occasion requires for inventory, binding, repair, cleaning, replacement, and for their security from insects and elements. As part of the problem of housing he must give attention to building construction and mainte-

nance and to fire protection and insurance; in order to lay his plans effectively he must be familiar with the laws of his commonwealth and the ordinances of his municipality as they concern libraries, with the political conditions in both state and city, with the social facts and traditions governing his community, with the educational preconceptions prevailing in it, with the institutions entering into his library's environment, and with the personalities likely to affect and be affected by his enterprise; as furthering his program he must be prepared to attend legislative sessions and hearings, committee gatherings, organization conferences, group assemblies, civic mass meetings, round tables and panels, and to address schools, clubs, conventions, classes, and forums. He must read in order to participate in building the stock of books, and must write and speak in order to convince committees, trustees, executive officers, and perhaps investigators; he must formulate budgets and check expenditures, and on occasion be prepared to inspect heating plants before recommending an installation; he must choose associates, plan their work, train them if necessary, supervise their performance, and commend, discipline, promote, retard, or dismiss as each case may require.

The work of a college or university librarian comprises duties comparable to those of a public librarian and hardly less diversified. He must choose the books for his collection, after a collaboration with faculties and departments in which he acts as coördinator, balancer of interests, and often final arbiter. The actual book-buying involves operations and routines similar to those employed in a public library, with modifications due to peculiarities in the material and its market and to necessary refinements in the maintaining of accounts. Housekeeping in the college or university library presents little that is unique; but adaptations to meet institutional needs appear in the classifying and cataloguing and

in the record systems. Building problems are analogous to those in the public library; and the relations which the municipal librarian maintains with government officers, civic groups, community leaders, and the public generally find counterpart in those the college librarian sets up with trustees, president, departments, committees, instructors, students, and alumni. Staff relations and management claim time in a college library as well as in other group enterprises. Also, over and above his obvious functions the college librarian may be called upon to teach, either in the classroom or through individual contacts, and to promote or to engage in research.

Examination of the activities in libraries of other types adds to the picture. Special librarians in various fields, for instance, are required to deal with extensive sources of information on restricted subjects, the material consisting perhaps only in slight measure of books and largely of pamphlets, pictures, clippings, reports, abstracts, documents, samples, and even references to data available in remote places or in the minds of individuals. The tools and stock of such a librarian call for peculiar methods in acquiring, housing, arranging, and utilizing; his clientele expects service based upon anticipation of demands and upon advance preparation for them, and submission of findings in whatever forms best suit its purposes; his technique includes all possible devices for gathering facts, and whatever vehicles may be necessary in their presentation. He needs to be familiar with his subject, ingenious and resourceful in his searching, and adaptable in meeting wants as changes come over his industry or institution. His field may be that of banking, insurance, communication, transportation, manufacturing, or other business; of law, economics, sociology, physics, chemistry, or biology; or of art, music, or philanthropy.

The school librarian, similarly, is in a sense a special librarian, although the expansion of his activity in recent years perhaps entitles him to a category of his own. Like the special librarian he works with material in divers forms, and with patrons whose interests are circumscribed although urgent. He must meet the child mind, discover its faculties, do his part in awakening them, and exercise necessary discipline without arresting sound impulses. He must deal with teachers in sundry relationships, respond to their calls for instructional matter and assistance, volunteer such aid and suggestions as may supplement classroom activity, offer guidance to sources perhaps unused and unrealized, keep himself conversant with developments affecting curricula and teaching methods, and often contribute definitely, if inconspicuously, to the management and program of his school. He is likely to be drafted for the supervision of debates, plays, exhibits, and school publications, to bear his share in monitorial assignments, and even to turn instructor, sometimes in the use of books and libraries and sometimes in other subjects.

Finally, the librarian who devotes himself to work with children typifies functions which may not be ignored in any comprehensive overview of the library field. Again he is the selector, the acquirer, the keeper, and the distributor of books, with whatever emphasis on the caretaking side is essential for methodical and responsible custodianship. His routines and special techniques, however, extend to such varied duties as the enforcement of cleanliness, the preparation of bulletins, the assembling of book exhibits, the management of clubs, and the telling of stories. He must be able to handle and to influence toward the appreciation and use of books the timid preschool child, the boisterous ten-year-old, and the bewildered adolescent; and incidentally he must effect some guidance, perhaps unsolicited and un-

realized, to parents. He needs to be friendly and skillful in his individual introductions to the world of books, and alert to pass his charges on to other hands the moment the time is ripe for this. To assure the environment essential to his ends he requires to be informed, as do public, college, special, and school librarians, concerning the buildings, furniture, equipment, and supplies appropriate for his work and concerning whatever else enters in a material way into the maintenance of quarters.

The foregoing paragraphs afford some portrayal of library work as it has characterized itself in the large. Its divisions might be enumerated to further lengths, including in the case of public libraries those appearing under the several forms of municipal organization as well as those supported by counties, states, provinces, other regional units, and central governments; in the instance of college and university libraries, those associated with professional schools and research agencies; among school libraries, those maintained in private institutions as well as those serving the more numerous public secondary and elementary schools; and in the special libraries group, beside those already suggested, such as may be connected with trade associations, amusement corporations, educational foundations, laboratories, legislatures, government departments, and in fact with any conceivable enterprise to which the assembling and availability of information is a necessity or even an aid. To describe the positions and tasks involved would require endless detailing, particularly since these vary with situations and in response to personal habits and views, as well as with needs and with materials. It is one thing to acquire, organize, preserve, and utilize a collection of currently published books, and quite another to handle one of fourteenth-century manuscripts, incunabula, pamphlets, broadsides, clippings, photographs, prints, or typewritten reports. It

makes a difference whether the service is being rendered to an individual scholar, to a student body, to a cosmopolitan public, or to some such agency as an investment house, a museum, or a city council. Finally, the duties of a given position depend for their cast and their interpretation upon the person who is performing them.

In spite of its many varieties there remain elements of homogeneity, if not of unity, in library work, since its differences are largely in application. Even a cursory review reveals a common core of aim, function, setting, scope, and process, all of which find substantiation in the ease with which librarians transfer from one section of their field to another. Considering all factors it would seem fair to place library work, puzzling as it may be to define, somewhere midway in an arrangement of occupations according to diversity. Certainly it is not as clearly delimitable as are the tasks of the pharmacist, or the accountant, or the nurse; on the other hand, it covers no such area as that of social work, comprehending as this does preventive, alleviative, and correctional effort under unnumbered private and public agencies, and recognizing bodies of knowledge and technique which can be related to each other only by virtue of their common humanitarian adaptation.

No estimate of library work and its nature can be quite complete without mention of the exigencies under which it has developed. Libraries originally having been regarded as luxuries, later as nonessentials, and only recently as in any sense necessities, it is not strange that most of their operations have had to be carried on under difficulties. The librarian from time immemorial has accepted this fact, doubtless because he stands high among those who look to their daily labors for life's satisfactions. In the early days his handicap was that of being his patron's man, with whatever of circumscription this might imply. Latterly it has

consisted rather in the lack of resources and of suitable status and working conditions, so that in large measure he has been obliged to make his bricks without straw. Naturally a calling which grows under such restrictions shows their influence. In the minds of those engaged in it the specific task is likely to assume undue importance, with too little regard to the whole of which it is a part; and the immediate duty and the way of performing it may preclude thought of why it is done and how far it conforms to a considered scheme and a determined objective. These effects, being circumstantial, suggest that the miscellaneous appearance of library work may be due less to intrinsic elements than to want of analysis and of systematizing. At least it is pertinent to consider whether, as the vocation continues to develop and as some of the librarian's traditional disabilities diminish, there may not emerge a less piecemeal view of his tasks and a more unified and reasoned conception of their meaning. This, with comparable questions, is taken up in the next chapter.

II

WHAT LIBRARY WORK IS BECOMING

THE work of librarians is continuing to develop, and indeed seems bound to do so if only because, like some other vocations, it is influenced by the society about it.^a While forecasts are hazardous in this as in other fields, some of the lines it is following are evident. Attention to the tendencies observable is important for librarians, since both their occupation as a whole and their individual prospects are affected. It is doubly so for those who guide preparation for the calling, whether their aim be to anticipate conditions or only to respond to them with appropriate adjustments.

It has been shown that early libraries ceased in time to stand merely for the preservation of manuscripts and books and became concerned with their use, and that initial notions of the service surrounding such use gradually amplified. Still further widening of intent might seem natural, and is to be encouraged. Librarians already view their tasks as so unlimited, however, that they seem apt henceforth to seek not so much new ends as the clarifying and effectuating of those already avowed. Certain of the directions they may take in doing this are suggested in the following paragraphs.

Before too much time has passed it may be desirable for librarians to attempt deliberate definition of their aims. Those among them may be right who press for a comprehensive statement of purpose or function which all may accept; or, if the terms seem more significant, for a philosophy or

^a See ref. 323.

rationale.^b This would entail conclusions as to what libraries can achieve which other agencies cannot; what relation they should bear to the sciences and to organized knowledge; what their place should be in education, in recreation, in community life, and in the national economy; what responsibility they should undertake, and whether this is to be passive or aggressive. The pertinence of such questions would be difficult to exaggerate where full grasp of a vocation is involved, and especially for novitiates. Certainly it is appropriate for any movement or group in some such way to mark out an area and to set a course. At the same time library work is so diversified that the things for which it stands may not be compressible into a simple or single formula, and this might be confining even if attainable. Perhaps the wise procedure for librarians is to select and describe their ends step by step rather than with finality. This would provide goals and standards, subject to progressive revision. It would ensure the flexibility essential in a social scene which shifts continually, and would foster the varied views and approaches required as conditions change. Hypotheses so arrived at would help libraries to plan soundly; and, with the doors to the future kept open, would bring needed satisfactions to the personnel. They would carry librarianship as far toward a philosophy as most callings have gone. They would charge each individual and generation with perfecting them, and so should stimulate growth.

There seems little doubt that conspicuous features in the library service of the future are to be new media and an enlarged basis and scale. As for the first, mechanical devices promise to take over whatever operations they can discharge; the materials stocked by libraries presumably are to include films and sound records as commonly as the

^b See refs. 76, 90, 139.

numerous varieties long represented in paper form; books and their equivalents are likely to be conveyed to users by whatever means of transport and communication are available; and libraries are apt to employ many of the practices which business has developed for reaching a public. For the second, there are to be anticipated the utilizing of broader knowledge and varied techniques in dealing with clients; the identifying of libraries in schools and colleges more indispensably with the processes of instruction; the associating of public libraries with larger geographical areas; the tapping of new reservoirs of support for library service; and a more nearly universal diffusion of books, through whatever channels and agencies lend themselves to this purpose and after thorough study on a national scale of the problems involved. Only time can tell how far means still novel are to be adopted or contrived. As with the aims of libraries, there need be no limits except those set by expediency.

To accomplish all they contemplate—and incidentally to meet pressure from without—libraries seemingly must seek ways of getting their work done at a lowered rate of expenditure in time and money. This effort has asserted itself particularly since 1920; and it appears in experiments for simplifying and cheapening routines and in the disposition to methodize an aggregate of tasks, some of which are classifiable and some promiscuous. The tendency it represents has not been integrated, but is evidenced in the utterances and writings of librarians^c and observers^d and is inherent in proposals for universal service and long-term planning.^e It looks toward gradual reorganization, based upon work analysis and leading to improved practices and to more systematic distribution of duties and arrangement of positions. Incident to it might come a clearer differentiation of

^c See refs. 49, 74, 167, 377.

^e See refs. 212, 264, 331, 353.

^d See refs. 172, 228, 338, 345, 358.

functions, vertically and into divisions according to objective, and horizontally according to level of difficulty and skill; accompanied by thorough departmentalizing, and by the definite stratifying which has appeared in some other callings and probably is logical in library work.^f A major result might be the general use of graded schemes of service, either in the shape of independent plans for individual libraries, or of certification arrangements state by state, or of civil service systems. Controls and emollients vital to efficiency thus would follow, namely, correct requirements for appointment and promotion, clear allocation of responsibility, periodic ratings of efficiency, remuneration as fair as circumstances permit, and possibly some shield against demoralization in time of stringency or stress. Also, librarians might discover in graded schemes of service an offset to the poverty, inadequate staffing, exigent schedule requirements, and extensive routine under which they labor.

Some progress toward clear and close organization already has been made. Schemes of service have been adopted by a limited number of libraries, certification measures are in force in a few states, and civil service has appeared here and there, although not always welcomed. Less has been achieved in departmentalizing and specializing. Stratification has lagged most of all, partly for want of analytical approach. It is true that relieving cataloguers of such tasks as typing, and segregating the duties of the readers' consultant from those of the charging desk, are not new; and that general formulae to cover such divisions have been sought, notably by Fargo and by the Certification Committee of the California Library Association.^g The California schedule lists duties to the length of several pages, and proposes, for example, that in the purchase of books "corresponding with publishers" and "supervising book budget records" be dis-

^f See refs. 26, 47, 90, 218, 220, 428, 446.

^g See refs. 91, 173.

sociated from the "typing of order lists" and the "clipping of checked book reviews," and that in circulation and registration work "sorting and filing book cards" and "counting and recording statistics" be separated from such offices as "determining rules" and "handling complaints." But the attempts so far made have been incomplete; none has taken full account of the elements; and all leave undetermined whether the work of librarians belongs upon two or upon more than two levels. Are there simply professional and clerical-mechanical duties, as the schemes mentioned suggest; or should there be recognized an intermediate group, calling at once for a high measure of knowledge and for facility in handling tools and devices and perhaps to be designated as technical? Certainly in any twofold arrangement it is difficult to assign the planning of a library report or bulletin, the establishing of an author's name for the catalogue, or the searching to ascertain whether a book recommended for accession is not already in stock. Assuming that stratification in some degree is desirable, questions of the kind thus illustrated must be answered before it can be achieved.

To more effective internal organizing, libraries may be expected to couple a closer accord in methods. It hardly can be consonant with progress to continue the traditional schemelessness, which is apparent in spite of some common practices. A beginning might be made with an agreement among libraries to pursue jointly their efforts for competency and to bring into effect a measure of codification; encouragement to which so far has depended largely upon the occasional contributions of individuals, committees, library staffs, and the faculties of library schools. How far the conformity needed is practicable may be a question, for with the demands upon librarians ranging from those made by the individual proprietor to those of a heterogeneous

public; with the materials in libraries differing as widely as does a clay tablet from a newspaper clipping; with settings as unlike as those of the arts college and the advertising office; and with the qualifications sought in librarians subject to these and other factors, it might seem futile to hope for coherence. Moreover, whatever pessimism librarians may feel on the subject is confirmed by the findings of the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration^h and the Library Curriculum Study.ⁱ It is hardly defensible, however, to assume that in such matters as cataloguing, the keeping of records, the conduct of a biography alcove, and the direction of a children's room, procedures are as fully regularized as is desirable, or as free as they might be from accidental elements. While uniformity has its perils, there probably are many points at which it would relieve rather than hamper library workers. If extended with proper safeguards it should establish practices of proved merit more widely, reduce the time required for various forms of service, diminish the costs inseparable from the transfer and turnover of staff members, and in the process draw libraries more closely together and simplify and expedite preparation for their work. Not all the forms such systematizing might take can be anticipated, but the occasion for it is obvious to anyone who compares the standards of operation in libraries with those of well-managed corporation offices.

The adoption of an authoritative terminology covering processes and positions could well be incidental to the codifying of practice. It might indeed seem corollary; but since the very lack of an accepted vernacular impedes understanding, and since apathy and conflict of interest may be a drag, exertion to hasten agreement is advisable. As is being recognized, the matter should not be left to chance or to incidental treatment.^j Some of the measures

^h See ref. 209.

ⁱ See ref. 103.

^j See refs. 11, 27.

presumably necessary are collection of the phrases used in libraries; comparison with usage in kindred fields; decision as to the terms to be adopted; tact in bringing proposals to attention; and, in good time, pressure for their acceptance. No body undertaking such steps could apply compulsion, but it would need to come as near to this as comity permits.

A natural sequel to improved internal organization would be more complete co-ordination among libraries, including, notably, division of their fields of service. This might mean allocation to particular libraries of responsibility for the collections on specific subjects or for the needs of given groups, efforts toward which are approved universally in principle and occasionally brought to some success. It might well comprehend, further, a distribution of activities, as represented for example in maintenance of a duplicate repository at only one point in a community, or of a research staff or the machinery for experimenting with new devices at only one library in an area. Even though most of the duties ordinarily carried on in a stated library are inseparable from its conduct, differentiation of the kind suggested may be more feasible than is assumed. It would be only a step from these forms of apportioning to the extension and perfecting of co-operative enterprises generally. If much of the process of cataloguing can be done with economy once for all in some central place or under a single authority, the application of the principle to interlibrary loans and to the preparation of bibliographies and book lists, for instance, should not be insuperable. On a larger scale, joint support of investigations and of some forms of book production should be practicable, as might be also collective responsibility in servicing territories whose demands exceed the capacity of individual libraries. As an outgrowth of all this there can be anticipated country-wide coverage, at first with the simplest advantages in the way of books, and eventually with

access to all the library materials and bibliographical resources which students and scholars require. Such developments should follow as a matter of course, and would put into librarians' hands, and at the disposal of their supporting clientele, facilities which neither can afford to neglect.⁶

Finally, libraries may face some readjustment to their constituencies. Determinations may be necessary as to how they should be related functionally to comparable agencies, and organically and administratively to the governmental or other bodies sponsoring them. Should public libraries stand as independent units or as divisions of major departments? Are they most favorably situated when conducted under general municipal civil-service plans or when otherwise operated? What is the optimum geographical or population area for a public library's activity; what criteria are applicable in governing its support; and what proportion of a community's funds properly may be allocated to it? What features should mark the laws underlying public libraries? Answers to such questions and to analogous ones touching the libraries of institutions and corporations should show what status and control are most suitable. In some aspects the prerequisite discussion and investigation are well advanced.⁷

Probably most librarians would agree that the developments suggested above are appropriate and plausible. As has been indicated in connection with terminology, however, something more than the drift of circumstances will be necessary to bring them about. The responsibility rests with librarians as a group, and calls for the long view and the sinking of predilections, and for directional skill. Two other factors are entailed, however, which deserve emphasis because they are relatively new to librarians; namely, (1) the

⁶ See ref. 264.

⁷ See refs. 8, 43, 52, 87, 214, 384.

full utilization of resources which are not domestic to the library field, and (2) the use of investigational procedures.

The occasion for drawing upon all expedients is illustrated well in those divisions of the librarian's activity represented by administration and information service. As regards the first, it is a commonplace that libraries can discern and discharge their functions only by understanding their clientele and establishing intimacy with it. These means are good as far as they go, but they are inadequate for comprehending and dealing with men in the mass, and require to be supplemented as reliable techniques for this come to hand. Again, librarians have made good use of their own experience and of the rules of common sense in building and leading staffs on restricted appropriations, but they can hardly be content with this now that a science of personnel management offers them guidance. Finally, the financial oversight of libraries, although usually carried on scrupulously, doubtless is subject to the systems and controls applied in business. Beside acquaintance with the ancillary fields instanced there may be serviceable in the conduct of public libraries conversance with various aspects of law, government, and sociology; in that of university libraries familiarity with teaching procedures, with the methods and apparatus of scholarship, and with the history of colleges and universities; and in both of these cases acquaintance with institutional administration, with the general field of education, and with social theory. The contributory subjects are indefinite in number, and take on fresh relevance whenever libraries are forced to re-examine and revalue their usefulness.

As concerns information service, a tendency has prevailed to treat this largely as a routine matter, for which facility in using a somewhat conventional list of tools is sufficient. So long as the work was centered in the reference rooms of small public libraries there was ground for such a view, but it is

passing with the rise of specialized collections and of the demand they reflect for exhaustive information in restricted fields. Examples of such collections appear in the sections of public libraries devoted to economics and technology; in the libraries maintained by universities for their schools of medicine and law; and, conspicuously, in the libraries supported for the use of corporations, research laboratories, and professional societies. It is unreasonable to suppose that adequate service can be rendered in such situations by persons not versed in the subjects concerned and in the methods of searching applicable to them, however adept they may be in manipulating manuals, handbooks, encyclopedias, and indexes.^m If in these circumstances a librarian is to be more than a caretaker and a purveyor, he must assemble material which he cannot know, uncover data he cannot recognize, and organize facts he cannot interpret, except he is himself something of an expert in the field. Unless they bring under their command the bodies of knowledge which their books and other material represent, librarians increasingly must affect functions for which they are unequipped. Tardiness in meeting evident requirements at this point may explain in part the unsatisfactory position of libraries in many communities and organizations, even though it is palpable that few constituencies are ready to pay for service of the quality in question.

The pertinence of investigational procedures reveals itself at many points. The surveying of communities and institutions to ascertain bases for the usefulness of libraries long has presented problems, and promises to be regularized and made more efficient as fitting techniques are imported from other fields. The need for building collections with tolerably precise reference to their effects has introduced studies of readers and of their habits, interests, and requirements;

^m See ref. 451.

together with analysis of the uses made of books, as to both their nature and extent, and inquiry into the subject matter, vocabulary, and format which influence the attractiveness and value of books. Again, the diversity in practice among libraries calls for further scrutiny, continuing that undertaken by the American Library Association Survey, the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration, and the Library Curriculum Study; so that there may be in hand full information as to the prevalent grouping of duties, the methods of their performance, the names applied to them, the stipends attached, and the requirements for their assumption. The deterioration of paper and bindings is compelling research for means of their preservation, and, together with limitations of space, is bringing similar effort for the production of more enduring records and for more economical ways of storage. Finally, the history of libraries and of the book arts still has to be written, and it has been shown that much remains to be done to delineate the librarian's office in various periods and circumstances; both are important if librarians are to appreciate their heritage and to plan their work in the light of experience and precedent. These examples are typical only, but suggest some of the effort essential if libraries are to be made adequate to the necessities of a people. In pursuing the facts desired there is needed a facility which as yet is rare among librarians. Expert aid from other fields may have to be drawn upon for some time to come, but always, it is to be hoped, with the expectation that librarians meanwhile will be qualifying themselves to conduct their own inquiries.ⁿ

Granting that the steps proposed would improve the status of libraries, what of the effects upon their personnel? Probably a changed picture would present itself to persons engaged in library work, to those contemplating it, and to those interested in preparation for it. If the service of libraries

ⁿ See ref. 444.

could be viewed as a whole as well as in sections, and as calling for application throughout of the system and logic which often have been reserved for its minutiae, it would offer an opportunity and a challenge heretofore unknown. It would press individuals participating in it for all the accomplishments they could muster, including thorough competence in procedures, ample general education, and the initiative, perspective, and judgment without which fitness of other kinds may be negligible.

What the perfecting of library service may mean to the group charged with it appears most clearly in its relation to kindred enterprises. Presumably librarianship is to find itself closer to other callings, perhaps overlapping them and overlapped by them. On its lower planes the affinities with neighboring occupations long have been taken for granted. Typing, the care of records, and sundry manual operations in libraries, for example, are so comparable to some duties elsewhere that workers might occupy posts interchangeably. To some degree the same holds on the next level, as has been shown by the migration of librarians to commercial, governmental, and institutional connections outside the library field. An assistant experienced in caring for his library's collection of pamphlets, for instance, may choose to become a digester or compiler of reports for a corporation; or a library cataloguer may convert himself into an indexer of state records. It is where administrative and scholarly activities are concerned, however, that the possibilities are most striking. Clothe the head of a municipal library with the accomplishments relevant to his success, and he either may seek his advancement in librarianship or transfer to some other post of educational or civic leadership. Vest the school librarian with the knowledge and skills which are appropriate to his position, and his way may be open either to rise as a librarian or to engage in teaching in case he so prefers.

Place in the headships of college and university libraries men who have all the desirable attainments, and, while some will continue to see their largest opportunities in library work, some may gravitate into forms of instruction associated with their posts and even into other departments of teaching, or may move toward deanships or other administrative offices.^o Appoint to the direction of special libraries persons possessing complete equipment for their tasks, and their paths of promotion may lie in their original fields or toward executive responsibilities in business or in their institutions. Possibly also the converse processes should operate more than they do at present, providing it be understood that in shifting to library work as well as from it proved fitness for a new sphere is requisite. The dimming of lines between vocations thus implied should be a wholesome thing, since such borders tend to be artificial and since the talents of individuals do not respect them. Assuming librarians fully qualified, there is neither logic nor expedience in trying to draw too closely the boundary between them and other persons engaged in education and social service in a community, nor the distinction between librarians and members of the teaching staff in a school or university; for the major objectives in each case are common, and some movement back and forth would give evidence that the groups were working in agreement and that gifts were being utilized fully.

As bearing upon the crossing of borders among vocations it may be noted that, although practitioners of most kinds are called upon for activity beyond the strictest interpretation of their tasks, the limits of library work are particularly vague. How difficult it is to set them is realized when the so-called "marginal responsibilities" are considered. Leonard^p used this term to express, by way of illustration, the

^o See ref. 216.

^p See ref. 230.

physician's obligation to concern himself with health and sanitary conditions in his community, and the duty of all professional men to contribute to constructive civic movements such encouragement as their training and positions render possible. But just where lie the marginal responsibilities of the librarian? If with the support of his board of trustees the municipal librarian advises churches, or corporations, or city departments in installing collections of books for their groups, or even if he serves as a director, committee member, or promoter of an adult-education program or an evening college, he has done scarcely more than his post requires. The same is true for the librarian of a school or university who participates in the revision of a curriculum, and of a laboratory librarian who assists in a project of research. It would be hard, in fact, to think of anything so undertaken which would be looked upon as alien; in consequence of which library work must be recognized as unable sharply to sever its marginal from its day-to-day responsibilities.

As they view the librarian's work and its place in community and institutional life, some persons may interest themselves in debating whether it has become a profession. Such a discussion is of dubious profit, since to recognize an occupation for what it is signifies more than to label it. At the same time the very diversity of librarianship and the endeavors under way to systematize its aspects render the question difficult to ignore. Moreover, certain features of the so-called professions are relevant to it and to its understanding by the public: namely, dependence upon a definite body of knowledge and technique, utilization of individual effort and responsibility of an intellectual nature, and acceptance of a given set of standards as governing purposes, conduct, and organization.^a Scrutiny of library work and of its possibilities

^a See refs. 69, 177, 196, 248.

reveals that it shares these characteristics; and analysis and stratification have gone far enough to indicate that its routines are secondary and can be concentrated on separate levels, thereafter perhaps to be relegated to ancillary vocations. These are the grounds for classifying it as essentially professional.

III

BEGINNINGS OF THE CURRICULUM

SOME such picture of library work as that presented in Chapters I and II is prerequisite to understanding the American library school curriculum and to dealing with it. Similarly essential is an overview of its growth to date, to which subject Chapters III and IV are devoted. This is the more necessary because no connected history of library schools has been compiled, and because explicit information on the conditions surrounding their inception and rise must be sought throughout a somewhat scattered literature. The sources are, in fact, reasonably abundant and not inaccessible, since by the time library schools were proposed librarians had formed an association and were represented by a printed organ; and since throughout their careers there has been every incentive for the issue by the schools of announcements and reports. The story can be gathered from periodical articles, from the proceedings and committee statements of the American Library Association, and from the publications of the schools; but it must be pieced together. Here space can be given only to those facts and influences which appear to have affected the curriculum in significant ways and to the major lines of development which they caused.

It should be emphasized that only the curriculum as it has grown in the United States of America and in Canada is under consideration. Some of the undertakings in education for librarianship abroad are replete with interest, notably the School of Librarianship at University College in London, the school which has operated with vigor and on a large

scale at Moscow since 1913, and the various agencies in Germany, Scandinavia, Czechoslovakia, China, and in the Latin countries on both sides of the Atlantic. Moreover, priority in the field belongs to Europe. Professional schools can be considered intelligently only in relation to their setting, however; and since library conditions differ widely from country to country, and because the information available in the United States regarding library schools elsewhere is meager, it has been impracticable to carry this study beyond North American limits.

The beginnings of the curriculum in the United States are traceable in four schools, which arose within a span of seven years. Three of these appeared in the east, and one in the middle west. The original was that opened at Columbia College, New York City, in 1887; this removed to Albany in 1889, and thereafter until its return to Columbia University as the School of Library Service in 1926 was known as the New York State Library School. In 1890 the Pratt Institute Free Library, in Brooklyn, inaugurated a class which later in the same year began to take on aspects of a library school.^a Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, followed with the announcement and opening of a school in 1892. In 1893 there was launched at Armour Institute in Chicago a similar undertaking, which four years later drew into affiliation with the state university and was transferred to Urbana, becoming the University of Illinois State Library School. All of these institutions are still operating, the only break in any having been a suspension at Drexel from 1914 to 1922.

It is pertinent here to inquire what purposes were in the minds of those who promoted the early library schools in the United States. As might be expected in view of comparable developments in some other callings, the impetus for the establishing of preparatory agencies came from within

^a See refs. 299, 309, 369.

the group concerned. Even if the pioneers in library work had not been persons of notable enthusiasm and devotion, they must soon have desisted tasks far beyond the capacities of themselves and of the small staffs associated with them. If these tasks were to be assumed and discharged, not only must libraries be supplied with books and resources, but a flow of competent workers must be assured. It is not surprising that this need asserted itself and induced appropriate action at specific libraries, the results taking the form of training or apprentice classes designed primarily to improve the local service;^b but it is significant that the plan which came earliest to fruition was conceived on broader lines. The Columbia College enterprise, as framed by Melvil Dewey, was designed to furnish a common avenue of qualifying for such recruits and staff members as might avail themselves of it, whatever their origins or wherever they intended to seek posts, thus at once equipping the new vocation on an important side and relieving libraries of the burden involved in individual teaching.^c Implied in it was recognition of a fact demonstrated and accepted without question later on, namely, that librarians were unable or unwilling as a regular thing to add general training responsibilities to their main duties.^d Of still more moment was the realization that instruction could be carried on economically, and in the comparative and comprehensive manner that library work required, only if vested in an institution with which it could be a first charge.^e It might have been advantageous if these viewpoints had received more attention at the start, for undoubtedly their neglect has confused standards, retarded the production of an adequate personnel, and entailed considerable waste of resources.

^b See refs. 232, 235, 242.

^c See refs. 47, 106, 109, 143, 275.

^d See ref. 21.

^e See refs. 109, 352.

The principles invoked in shaping the curriculum are not as manifest as might be wished, partly because the discussions from which they emerged covered a decade prior to the opening of the School of Library Economy at Columbia College in 1887 and presumably were not recorded with completeness,^f and partly because there was little occasion to make them explicit. Enough may be deduced, however, to indicate their essentials, prominent among which naturally was effort to reflect accurately the features characterizing library work in its various forms. The full reach appears in Dewey's statement that the Columbia aim was "to give the best obtainable advice, with specific suggestions on each of the hundreds of questions that rise from the time a library is decided to be desirable till it is in perfect working order, including the administration"; likewise in the long list of topics appended to this statement.^g The announced intention had been forecast by an invitation for suggestions and criticisms,^h and was borne out by the civil service examination set for prospective library school teachers at the New York State Library in 1889.ⁱ Other schools as they came along used a similar approach in shaping their offerings. The head of the Pratt Institute Free Library declared that its class "takes up the library processes in systematic order, beginning with the order department and following a book through its course into the hands of the borrower and back again";^j and presently detailed the specific subjects treated.^k The enumeration of items comprising the instruction at Drexel Institute^l was only less lengthy than that of Columbia College; while Armour followed a similar course at the start,^m and in its announcements somewhat later specified teaching "in each department of library work."ⁿ

^f See ref. 45.

^g See ref. 141.

^h See ref. 309.

ⁱ See ref. 59.

^j See refs. 109, 144.

^k See ref. 299.

^l See refs. 151, 161.

^m See refs. 58, 407.

ⁿ See ref. 143.

Not only was the curriculum to be faithful in representing library work as a whole, but it and the instruction were to acquaint students thoroughly and at first hand with the actual tasks entailed. This is emphasized regarding Columbia in the assurance that the purpose was "entirely practical," in the plan for "object teaching,"^o and in the assertion that "however excellent may be the results from the lectures, instruction, seminars, problems and visits, the main reliance must be on experience."^p Pratt and Armour gave an important place to their "apprenticeship";^q Drexel, to its work assignments;^r and Armour was reported early as surpassing the original library school in the stress "laid upon the practical things of library life."^s All this is not to suggest that the reasons underlying procedures were ignored, for the teaching unquestionably was too intelligent to permit that. Moreover, there is some evidence that the original library school was not universally regarded as bound to the practical lines laid down for it.^t The predominant intent, however, doubtless was that echoed in the initial announcement of a later school, namely, that its courses were "practical rather than theoretical."^u

It should be noted that the common endeavor to represent library work as students would face it did not preclude differences of aim among the schools at other points. While libraries of all existing kinds doubtless were kept in view generally, with public libraries foremost,^v Pratt^w and Drexel^x tended to fit for subordinate positions rather than for management. Again, Columbia and New York State made no provision for broadening students' cultural equipment, because it was assumed that the courses necessary for this already were supplied amply at Columbia College and

^o See refs. 109, 144.

^p See ref. 110.

^q See refs. 58, 59, 299, 307, 369.

^r See refs. 151, 158, 161, 225.

^s See ref. 23.

^t See ref. 20.

^u See ref. 96.

^v See ref. 169.

^w See refs. 299, 308.

^x See ref. 226.

elsewhere^y and because the library school entrance conditions presently were adjusted to this; ^z whereas Pratt, Drexel, and Armour included liberal studies, since they considered it impossible or undesirable to insist upon any specified amount of education as prerequisite for entrance.^{aa} Such variations as these, however, apparently affected the emphasis upon practical matters only insofar as they helped to determine the time available for it.

In passing, also, the effort to exhibit library practices and problems completely calls attention to the procedures used in building the early curriculum. Such lists of tasks as that already mentioned^{ab} seem to have been the main guide; and, however well they served, the results must have been open to omission and disproportion and could not have been demonstrably good until the library school product met its test in the field. Moreover, imitation crept in, and was practiced definitely and frankly in curriculum building even by some of those who contributed most to the developing of library schools.^{ac} It is only fair to point out, however, that the methods thus indicated were by no means peculiar to the schools of the 1880's and the 1890's. Due partly to the lack of resources and the want of more appropriate techniques, they must be relied upon even today.

The general character of the early curriculum has been implied rather fully in considering the influences which produced it, but some attention is due to certain of its specific features and to the impressions it made upon librarians. In content it veered even more than might have been expected toward the preoccupation with methods foreshadowed in the prospectus and perhaps in the title of the parent school. It is true that in the original Columbia College plan there was promised teaching in bibliography and

^y See refs. 110, 143.

^{ab} See refs. 109, 144.

^z See refs. 23, 115, 285.

^{ac} See refs. 59, 226, 303, 354, 356, 369, 411.

^{aa} See refs. 23, 225, 303, 354, 356.

“reading and aids”; a survey of the library field, for which the term “library economy” was strangely used as a caption; and a presentation of the position, founding, extension, governing, housing, staffing, and disciplinary problems of libraries. But the same publication gave no less dignified a heading than “administration” to the extended listing of what today would be thought of largely as “routines,” “methods,” and minor “techniques”; and confirmed previous announcements of aim by reprinting extracts from the proposal regarding the school made to the Board of Trustees of Columbia College in 1883, among which was the statement that “only the technical parts of the work would require treatment.”^{ad} It also featured instruction on “preserving and making available the results of thought, study and reading,” referring by this to notebooks, clippings, indexing, longhand and shorthand writing, typewriting, preparing matter for the press, and proofreading; with what measure of attention to cultivating the skills involved is not stated. While the apportionment of time to divisions of the work is not recorded, the evidence here as well as elsewhere is that concern for methods was preponderant. This condition was repeated at the other early schools as they got under way, such subjects as cataloguing, classification, accession work, loan systems, and care of shelves, together with some actual drill, invariably appearing;^{ae} the study of bookbinding and typewriting being prominent;^{af} and stenography and bookkeeping being included in some cases.^{ag} Against this background are to be put the facts that among the schools generally at their inception there was planned almost no study of the factors involved in building book collections; that the consideration of reference books appears to have been somewhere secondary; and

^{ad} See ref. 110.

^{af} See refs. 151, 161, 309, 354, 369.

^{ae} See refs. 23, 151, 161, 275, 309, 354, 369.

^{ag} See refs. 23, 369.

that at Columbia and Pratt but incidental attention, if any, was given to the history of printing and of libraries.^{ah} It is true that these omissions were soon remedied; but their occurrence at all is a significant commentary on the notion of library work that prevailed at the time even in the minds of leaders. The central interest was processes, in varying significance and degrees of dignity, but always processes, even when such an activity as reference service was concerned. It is small wonder that in its initial years at Albany the New York State Library School suffered characterization as virtually "a glorified apprentice class," as devoting overmuch attention to mechanical detail, and as "teaching method without science, praxis before principle";^{ai} and that the Pratt Institute school found it not unbecoming to plan a material part of its instruction in apprenticeship form and in such a way as to benefit the associated library.^{aj}

Some few other components of the early curriculum call for particularizing. One was a course in current events, proved necessary by shortcomings in students' conversance with the content of periodicals, and begun at New York State by 1891-92 and at the other schools by 1895-96.^{ak} Another was the "library linguistics" introduced at Columbia College at the start,^{al} although not mentioned in the first circular of information, and given a place at Pratt Institute presently.^{am} This aimed at equipping students to catalogue and handle foreign books, chiefly French and German. At Columbia it seems to have been confined to bibliographical terms, forms of proper names, facts pertinent in transliteration, and similar matter. At Pratt Institute presumably it tended to embrace more elementary work in

^{ah} See refs. 58, 59, 109, 110, 151, 161, 309, 354, 369.

^{ai} See refs. 19, 112, 286.

^{aj} See ref. 369.

^{ak} See refs. 20, 22, 23, 158.

^{al} See refs. 107, 111, 351.

^{am} See refs. 21, 303, 313, 314.

languages. While not itself strictly a method or technique, it classifies with those features of the curriculum.

The remaining item deserving attention is such general background study as was commonly regarded essential to a career concerned with books. Although this was not included at Columbia College, the faculty there did think it worth while to schedule a series of lectures by "authors and specialists," the idea apparently being that a presentation of certain historical periods and literary productions would aid students in later years in using their library collections;^{an} this side of the instruction was not described in the early issues of the prospectus and therefore cannot be followed in detail, but apparently it soon declined under the pressure of the main program.^{ao} At the other schools in the 1890's liberal matter was prominent,^{ap} for reasons already stated. Pratt offered courses in literature, beginning with English and American and soon broadening them to cover "oriental, classical and modern continental literature as well."^{aq} Drexel provided a course presumably of substantial weight entitled "Outlines of the history of English literature and the important epochs of European literature";^{ar} and Armour not only incorporated courses and talks on literature in its program but encouraged students to attend lectures on history in another department of the Institute.^{as} In each of these cases the heart of the instruction seems to have been study of literature or history as such, rather than any systematic consideration of the books and other tools notable in these fields. Such teaching also appears to have been quite apart from that in the bibliography of particular subjects, as presented often by specialists outside the library-school faculties, which from the earliest times has qualified legitimately for a place in the curriculum.^{at}

^{an} See refs. III, 350. ^{aq} See refs. 293, 309. ^{as} See ref. 354.

^{ao} See ref. 114. ^{ar} See refs. 151, 158, 161. ^{at} See refs. 59, 110, 151, 158, 161,

^{ap} See ref. 23.

In length as well as in content the early curriculum reflected highly practical considerations. Columbia College at the start announced a three-month term, which was lengthened, upon class petition, to four months; in the second year it extended the basic program to seven months and added a similar period of advanced study; in the third year, toward the end of which came the removal to Albany, an eight-month session was provided for both classes; and this was expanded still further subsequently.^{av} Pratt began on a six-month basis, with the addition of a three-month apprenticeship which presently became an integral part of the school year.^{av} Drexel's original announcement provided for two four-month terms, although a delayed start in the initial year presumably abbreviated the first of these.^{av} Armour Institute opened with a single academic year and shortly lengthened its program to include a second.^{az} It is impossible to tell from the records how marked the effort was in these experimental days to adjust the extent of the curriculum to the matter; but since the content itself was not settled according to precise means and since other circumstances had to be considered, in all likelihood this was slight. Columbia's original plan probably and its first extension certainly were governed by the amount of time students were believed ready to devote to the work, events showing that the school at first undershot the mark.^{av} Doubtless the fact that the instruction generally was given by persons holding library positions also tended to fix limits, since staff members could not be asked to add indefinitely to existing burdens. Finally, the connection with teaching institutions, whose academic years already were set, undoubtedly exerted an effect. Interesting as is the span of the curriculum in the early schools, however, its significance would be easy to

^{av} See ref. 275.

^{av} See refs. 299, 307, 309.

^{av} See refs. 151, 161.

^{az} See refs. 22, 59, 354.

^{av} See refs. 110, 275.

overrate, especially because one notably equivocal component was involved. Actual work in libraries was so ever-present, and in forms and amounts so difficult of evaluation, that not too much can be inferred from the total number of weeks and months covered by enrollment. As has been true subsequently, and as has been the case likewise in schools serving other vocations, a nine-month program may or may not have represented more substantial instruction than one occupying seven months.

In organization the early curriculum took a variety of shapes. If the work and problems entering into the conduct of libraries were to be presented, there was no escape from dealing in some way with a long list of items. Some attempt to group them showed itself soon,^{az} but in spite of planning the Columbia College program apparently lacked coherence, one observer making the point that it would be desirable to see "a certain number of hours proportioned to the importance of the subject assigned to each department";^{ba} and at Pratt Institute the conspicuous feature, early if not at the outset, was a multiplicity of apparently detached topics.^{bb} Doubtless the fragmentary character of the early schemes suggests less effectiveness in execution than really existed, yet it gave warrant for a later tendency to look upon the compact, systematic arrangement of matter either as unimportant or as unattainable. Aside from the inherent difficulties in achieving close organization, the common looseness of plan probably was due to lack of familiarity and concern with principles of course structure on the part of those who promoted library schools, and perhaps to the absence of refinement in such matters in the institutions at which most of the early library schools were launched. Then, too, the lack of definitions and of a terminology may well have impeded efforts at systematizing, particularly in

^{az} See refs. 110, 151, 161. ^{ba} See refs. 19, 113. ^{bb} See refs. 309, 313, 314, 316.

so far as conference and joint action among the schools went.

Certain agencies comparable in purpose to library schools call for mention at this point because they arose or were planned in the period under review. It has been shown that the same impulse which brought library schools into being sometimes caused the conduct of training or apprentice classes in and for individual libraries. Where such classes did not evolve into library schools they operated somewhat in parallel,^{bc} displaying a measure of similarity as regards subjects of instruction. Much that has been said about the aims and features of the early curriculum in library schools would apply to these training and apprentice classes; and if the programs of the latter made any contribution to early library-school growth other than as parts of a common undertaking, it is not distinguishable.

The other enterprise, namely, summer sessions in library methods, embodied instruction more superficial than that which marked the library schools proper and yet broader in intent than that of the training and apprentice classes. It grew as naturally as did the schools and classes when means of qualifying for library work were most needed, and when any preparation was better than none. The New York State Library School in 1896, after the matter had been considered for most of a decade, initiated a summer session, designed mainly to present simple and elementary library processes to persons who held library positions in New York State and were unable to go to Albany for a year's residence.^{bd} The teaching represented such excerpts from the regular library-school program as a six-week period permitted; some subjects had to be omitted, and those included had to be condensed.^{be} Moreover, it differed from the offerings at the early library schools in the avoidance of practical drill

^{bc} See refs. 81, 232, 235, 242.

^{bd} See refs. 275, 286, 287.

^{be} See ref. 288.

and in the lack of cultural elements. It was in fact a separate thing, serving a distinct purpose; and while springing from the plan of instruction as evolved at the schools, probably reacted upon this slightly, if at all.

No other formal teaching agencies seem to have appeared in the years under consideration. The New York State Library School saw possibilities in correspondence work and projected it, but got no further.^{b/} As for the isolated courses in library methods which since have shown themselves numerous at colleges, interest in vocational training at such institutions in the early days was not strong enough to provide ground fertile for them. Even if correspondence teaching and college instruction had begun, it is unlikely that they would have exerted material effects upon the curriculum, since they tend to be concerned with segments of library work rather than with its entirety.

^{b/} See refs. 275, 276, 277.

IV

GROWTH OF THE CURRICULUM

THE spread of education for librarianship since its initial years makes a somewhat diffuse story, and one whose details might easily be allowed to obscure such lines of curriculum development as are discernible. New library schools arose with frequency; and of those alone which have come to be accredited officially, three were founded between 1895 and 1904, inclusive, five in the decade following this, two in the ten years from 1915 to 1924, and fifteen subsequently.^a Meanwhile the interest of librarians in the preparation of recruits heightened and affected all relevant enterprises. As explaining what happened to the curriculum after the organizing years it is important to examine one by one those factors, whether originating within or without the schools, which can be identified as influencing it.

There is no way of knowing what has been the strongest single force operating upon the curriculum, but well to the fore, certainly, has been the series of American Library Association committees concerned with library schools. These stretch back to 1883,^b and their early activity is recounted partially in statements and citations appearing in Chapter III of this volume. They became more prominent as time went on,^c and often gave expression to opinions touching the curriculum. That of 1902-3, for example, reported on changes then recent, pointed out weaknesses, and urged the establishing of standards;^d and its successor two years later carried out these recommendations by submitting as part

^a See refs. 12, 14.

^b See refs. 47, 145, 279.

^c See ref. 189.

^d See ref. 30.

of a code a minimum list of subjects of instruction.^e That serving over the period 1913-17 made such a study as it could, by visit and by correspondence, of the facilities available in preparation for library work, in connection with which some general suggestions regarding the curriculum were formulated.^f Working in common interest with these committees, beginning in 1909,^g was a Professional Training Section of the Association; this afforded a forum rather than a medium of action, but was probably not less influential than the committees on that account. The service of both lay in their practice of scrutinizing the schools and giving collective if not authoritative voice to what individuals observed regarding them. Although moves toward a kind of accrediting were discussed in 1907-8 and 1913-14 by the committees of those years,^h nothing of this nature was contemplated seriously until the Temporary Library Training Board framed its proposals in 1924.ⁱ What followed was the creation of the Board of Education for Librarianship, a strengthened form of committee on library training, empowered not only to inspect, to evaluate, and to express judgments on various agencies, but to exert whatever pressure might inhere in a public classification of schools.^j Ostensibly this Board might have stipulated what the schools were to teach, and with what emphasis; but it has proved sparing of prescriptions in this direction, and disposed to stress school organization rather than the make-up of courses. As a consequence its effect upon the curriculum, though potentially great by reason of its charter and its influence with sources of appropriation, has been qualified and largely indirect. Its various "suggested curricula,"^k lacking mandate, have served rather as guides to new schools and as commentaries for old than as canons for any. The Board

^e See ref. 31.

^f See refs. 36, 37, 38, 39.

^g See ref. 48.

^h See refs. 33, 36.

ⁱ See ref. 54.

^j See ref. 10.

^k See ref. 10.

presumably has used them in consultation, and some schools may have been affected otherwise by them;¹ probably, for example, they have had something to do with the spread of elective courses in recent years.^m Other than in this way, the Board of Education for Librarianship has influenced the curriculum chiefly through urging university affiliation for library schools; a natural result of which in some cases may have been a clearer course organization,ⁿ and certainly has been an effort at conformity to academic practice, even where there was no university connection. These outcomes have been material, although they are concerned more with form than with content, and reveal little of that tendency to restrain individuality often attributed to accrediting bodies.

Another factor which cannot be measured, but which may well have played a large part in shaping the schools' offerings, is the views of librarians, including alumni, and of students. To some degree these have been headed up in American Library Association committee pronouncements, as already implied.^o Less frequently, but quite as forcefully, they have come through such bodies as the Library Workers Association, which from 1920 to 1922 was active in protest at the absence of facilities for acquiring library-school credentials through summer courses and extension study.^p Often, however, they have been submitted by individuals, and even as a result of solicitation. In the pages of the *Library Journal* from time to time there have been printed the comments of librarians upon the curriculum, varying in tenor but unfailingly of a kind to command the attention of faculties;^q beside which, conference papers and discussions frequently have voiced such needs or demands as their originators have felt moved to urge.^r Again, the alumni of library schools have not lagged behind those of American colleges in evincing

¹ See refs. 266, 267, 291, 292.

^m See refs. 244, 249, 250, 419.

ⁿ See refs. 94, 95, 170.

^o See refs. 30, 31, 36, 37,

38, 39.

^p See ref. 252.

^q See refs. 138, 186.

^r See refs. 50, 223.

pride and proprietorship in their institutions, and both singly and as groups have been free with advice and suggestions, much of which apparently has been acted upon.* Finally, since library-school classes normally have contained considerable numbers of experienced librarians, it has been natural to regard their judgments upon the curriculum as carrying weight. Pratt Institute has been conspicuous in this as well as in its consultation with alumni,[†] although the procedure is one wholly in accord with the predominant attitude of faculties to students in library schools generally.

In recent years the somewhat sporadic influence of individual librarians and groups has been augmented by systematic inspection, resulting at times in specific criticism and proposals. The first and most noteworthy of these was the survey of library schools sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, the object of which was to subject them to the kind of scrutiny which schools of medicine, law, and engineering had undergone,[‡] and thus to promote an improvement of personnel in library work. The report of this study[§] assembled the facts regarding the library-school curriculum as it existed about 1920, and by publishing these and dwelling upon their significance impelled the schools to reexamine their organization and offerings. Probably actual curriculum changes due solely to it were few, partly for the reason that its sequel in the form of the Temporary Library Training Board so soon occupied the stage and focused attention upon a new set of findings and upon an impending classification of schools; but its effects were not the less real because indirect. Other analyses pertinent to the curriculum have come along since, and still others have been projected. The examination of circulation work and of other composite library activities, begun as the Library Curriculum Study

* See refs. 29, 281, 325, 327, 328, 427.

† See refs. 303, 328.

‡ See refs. 180, 253, 330, 337.

§ See ref. 445.

under the Board of Education for Librarianship in 1925, sought to assemble data which might be used not only in the production of textbooks but in the reconstruction of parts of the library-school curriculum;^u the result of this, like that of most of the influences considered so far, has been roundabout, for the undertaking avoided the actual outlining of courses and relied upon the textbooks to work such changes as the matter collected might indicate. Efforts somewhat similar but less ambitious include the investigation touching the curriculum for school librarians made in 1930-32 by an American Library Association committee under Stone,^v and the recommendations as to the preparation of children's librarians derived in 1933 by an American Library Association committee led by Ingersoll.^v These projects have directed attention to certain aspects of course organization—witness in the case of the Library Curriculum Study the implied conclusion that book selection and order work call for separate treatment both in textbooks and in the curriculum;^z and they utilize methods which deserve further exploration.

Some occurrences quite without the library field, also, have affected the curriculum. Although the scrutinizing of professional education which began in the United States about 1905 was not exemplified in the field of librarianship until about 1920, as has been shown, its possible application to library schools had reached librarians long before it interested any foundation,^{aa} and the modest examination carried on from 1913 to 1917 by the American Library Association Committee on Library Training is doubtless ascribable in part to it. Perhaps the major outside influence, however, has been the rise in educational level in the American population generally, accompanied by enhanced quali-

^u See ref. 10.

^v See ref. 376.

^v See ref. 53.

^z See refs. 162, 163.

^{aa} See refs. 33, 34.

fications in the applicants who knock at the doors of library schools. This has changed the complexion of both classes and faculties; and, having done so, naturally has caused some modifications in the curriculum as well as in teaching. For example, foreign languages need not be taught if students have mastered them before enrolling; and a school necessarily feels pressure to arrange its offerings convincingly when it has to deal no longer with the product of high schools and of informal or unacademic education, but solely with adults who have spent three or four years at well-organized colleges.

Naturally the immediate agents in curriculum changes have been the faculties as such, however much as individuals their members may have been played upon by proposals and pressure arising with librarians or elsewhere. Sometimes they have evolved innovations, as happened when the Carnegie Library School introduced courses for school librarians in 1917 and when it entered the general field in 1918;^{ab} in other cases there seems to have been close reference to a model, as presumably was true when Drexel Institute Library School was revived in 1922.^{ac} More significant than occasional action on either basis in particular instances, however, has been the group effort of the faculties to cope with such problems as confront them in common. This showed itself first in a call for a gathering of library-school instructors in 1911, at which the balance of the curriculum and the interrelations of first-year and second-year programs were among the topics discussed.^{ad} After a series of such informal annual conferences there was set up in 1915 the Association of American Library Schools,^{ae} the object of which was to facilitate systematic attention to the specific difficulties of teaching and management, as contrasted with

^{ab} See ref. 100.

^{ac} See refs. 159, 403.

^{ad} See ref. 166.

^{ae} See refs. 137, 452.

the general consideration of policies and results in which the groups representing the American Library Association primarily were interested.^{af} The contributions of this body from the curriculum standpoint have consisted in its constitutional stipulations as to the purpose and length of the curriculum; in the authority vested in its officers to scrutinize courses in the process of admitting or reexamining schools;^{ag} in the studies of the teaching of particular subjects made by its committees;^{ah} and in the continuing discussion of curriculum problems which it has stimulated.^{ai} Although never notable for aggressiveness it nevertheless was the first agency to effectuate standards of any kind for library schools, and throughout its career has been the one best situated to attack problems of course organization. With the rulings of the Board of Education for Librarianship in effect the occasion for its preoccupation with formal standards has passed, but its other functions are as relevant as ever.

One somewhat passive influence remains for mention, namely, tradition, as represented in supposedly settled practices of library work^{aj} and in methods which existing schools have followed.^{ak} In part this factor continues the imitative tendencies evident in the earlier period, as discussed in Chapter III.^{al} It has had a considerable place, as attested for instance by the fact that after the New York State Library School inaugurated its extended inspection trips to eastern cities, most other library schools followed suit and made such visits a fixed part of their programs, whether or not their locations were remote from important library centers. To some degree its use may have been deliberate, as suggested by Plummer.^{am} It undoubtedly accounts in a measure for the fact that the curriculum rarely has overstepped certain rather definite confines.

^{af} See ref. 324.

^{ai} See ref. 62.

^{al} See refs. 59, 226, 303, 354, 356,

^{ag} See ref. 60.

^{aj} See ref. 186.

369, 411.

^{ah} See refs. 63, 64, 67.

^{ak} See ref. 194.

^{am} See ref. 300.

Without entering upon a detailed consideration of content, there may be pointed out some of the changes that showed earliest in the curriculum as some of the foregoing influences operated. To begin with, a reaction appeared soon from the excessive emphasis upon methods prominent in the beginning. Attention to the teaching of reference books increased,^{an} and instruction in the history of libraries^{ao} and of printing^{ap} grew, although it sometimes was assigned to advanced programs. More significantly, there began and evolved rapidly the study of what came to be known as book selection, that is, all that enters into the choice of books for purchase, and, perhaps inferentially, for recommendation to readers. Notwithstanding that there was no organized work in book selection at Columbia College, its beginnings are visible under the headings "reference" and "reading and aids" in the 1886-87 circular.^{aq} By 1889-90 at Albany the senior bibliographical problems and some of the seminar activities took on the character of book-selection assignments; also, Wednesday was designated as "book day," students spent an hour a day through the rest of the week among the shelves, and in the course of their work were called upon to choose titles from the *Publishers' Weekly*.^{ar} A course in book selection as such, superseding the seminars in which that subject had centered since 1889, was inaugurated in 1893-94.^{as} Comparable developments took place at other schools. As early as 1897-98 Illinois included courses in the selection of books both in its first-year and second-year work, this presumably as part of an effort to restrict its instruction to "library topics."^{at} About 1899 Pratt substituted for its course in English and American literature a treatment from the library standpoint of contemporary

^{an} See refs. 152, 225, 275, 276, 301, 318, 369, 409.

^{ao} See refs. 154, 275, 301, 316, 407.

^{ap} See refs. 25, 278, 314, 318.

^{aq} See ref. 110.

^{ar} See refs. 18, 233, 234.

^{as} See ref. 21.

^{at} See refs. 356, 407.

fiction,^{av} and later added book selection definitely.^{av} Drexel, which seems from the outset progressively to have shaped its presentation of literature to fit library uses and interpretations,^{aw} finally evolved from its study of books and authors a course in book selection.^{az} By 1896, also, Drexel, Armour, and New York State were devoting time to the study of children's literature.^{ay}

In keeping with the enhanced attention to books was the withdrawal of certain matter which at some schools had been admitted to the curriculum experimentally, but which in time came to be considered extraneous. Very early the parent school was reported as being less completely engrossed with mechanical processes than at its beginning.^{az} Before many years had passed "literary methods," as offered originally at Columbia College, apparently was discarded or dispersed.^{ba} Pratt, which particularly had gone beyond the conventional bounds for a time and had offered typewriting, stenography, bookkeeping, and composition, dropped these subjects after brief trial.^{bb} Significantly, too, this institution, in acquiring definitely the status of a library school, had shifted its emphasis from local to comparative study of library procedures.^{bc} Drexel announced at its beginning instruction in "business (including typewriting, correspondence, and statistics)," ^{bd} but this apparently soon became pointed expressly toward library applications, and as other features of the work expanded it took a less important place in the curriculum.^{be} By 1903 Pratt was reported as having reorganized its work assignments on an instructional, as against a service, basis.^{bf} As final confirmation of a change in view there may be placed beside the developments cited, for whatever they are worth, certain professions on the part

^{av} See refs. 25, 303, 311.

^{aw} See refs. 301, 318.

^{aw} See refs. 24, 153, 225, 369.

^{az} See ref. 156.

^{av} See ref. 23.

^{az} See ref. 20.

^{ba} See ref. 282.

^{bb} See refs. 23, 301, 369.

^{bc} See refs. 325, 369.

^{bd} See ref. 161.

^{be} See ref. 154.

^{bf} See ref. 369.

of the schools and comments coming from observers. Illinois sought to impress candidates with the wide responsibilities of the careers for which they contemplated preparing;^{ba} and the Drexel announcements reiterated that library work includes a "literary, or bibliographical side, as well as a technical."^{bb} Most striking of all, New York State not only was commended in 1892 for having broadened its teaching by the introduction of reading seminars,^{bi} but by 1903 was credited with a new attitude; while aiming at "not less perfection of detail in technical instruction," it was said to recognize that the correct idea of the librarian's task called for removing this from the foremost place.^{bj}

By the time fresh schools began to appear the adjustments with which the four older ones had been struggling were about completed. The omissions and errors of the pioneers having for the most part been corrected, the newcomers enjoyed the benefit of a tested model. They were not markedly original, and either started with well-rounded programs of the accepted sort or very shortly achieved these. From this point forward the story mainly is one of conformity to a basic outline, plus variations in emphasis within the limits of this and an occasional experiment beyond them. Notwithstanding the tendency of any curriculum to gather mass and the trials of library-school faculties in covering all the ground deemed necessary, surprisingly few items occur in the typical program of the later years which are not to be found, in rudimentary form at least, in the early study plans. It is of interest, nevertheless, to examine what the newer schools, and incidentally the old, did with the accepted curriculum, as well as with such new ideas as they brought forth.

Before proceeding to consider developments it is worth noting that as the new schools took shape they followed two

^{ba} See ref. 407.

^{bb} See refs. 158, 225, 226, 369.

^{bi} See ref. 20.

^{bj} See ref. 369.

rather distinct avenues. In some instances there was a tendency to repeat the processes and episodes characteristic of the early enterprises. The Syracuse University School, for example, in the years between its establishment as a training class in 1896 and its elevation to the position of a school in 1908, seems to have exhibited some of the practical emphasis which was characteristic of the earlier undertakings at Columbia College and elsewhere.^{bk} Again, Simmons College, opening its library school in 1902, announced no instruction in book selection and history of libraries at the start;^{bl} then added both within a few years.^{bm} On the other hand, the school at Western Reserve University, begun in 1904 with a public library and an endowment, as well as a university, supporting it, presented in its first year a complete and balanced curriculum and mapped a second-year program to supplement it.^{bn} This contrast in procedure is traceable in still other instances; although with more widely disseminated knowledge of what had been done and of what was involved, and particularly with the rise of an accrediting body, the schools coming newly upon the scene tended more and more to start where others stood at the time.

The years since 1900 have been marked by the gradual retirement of some subjects which for good reasons survived the earlier process of weeding and readjustment. Current events as well as "library linguistics" called for less attention as the general educational equipment of students improved, the need for drill in foreign bibliographical terms and abbreviations being lessened also by the publication in convenient book form of compilations dealing with such matter. At the same time there has been some revival of elements which had seemed to be receding. Instruction in typing was given emphasis at Western Reserve; for although this school

^{bk} See refs. 381, 382, 383.

^{bl} See ref. 360.

^{bm} See refs. 361, 362, 364.

^{bn} See ref. 433.

originally required merely that students present or achieve ability to use the typewriter with proficiency, it put the subject into course form in 1908-9 and kept it there until 1915-16.^{bo} The same institution treated handwriting, including note taking, in similar fashion, including it in a course from 1907-8 to 1912-13.^{bp} The Simmons school, influenced doubtless by the facilities of other Simmons departments, stressed business methods and accounts, introducing this group of topics by 1903-4 and retaining it with some regularity thereafter.^{bq} Simmons also imposed instruction in shorthand at one period;^{br} and the Carnegie Library School included business methods and, in minor degree, handwriting.^{bs} Pratt, in spite of a change in its scheme for work in libraries which might have been expected to reduce the time spent in this way, actually increased assignments of this kind by about fifty percent between 1895 and 1908;^{bt} beside which it inaugurated a "paid apprenticeship" for those intending to be children's librarians.^{bu} Simmons announced for 1904-5 a requirement of three months of approved library experience before award of the certificate in the case of students compressing all their class work into one year;^{bv} a stipulation which it later stiffened to six months,^{bw} then relaxed to the form of "professional work" without specified term,^{bx} and did not relinquish entirely until 1918-19.^{by}

The later period has witnessed also in cases the elaboration of items which were present in the early curriculum but received no great prominence there. The place of the public library in its community, for example, was treated at Columbia College under the heading of the "scope and usefulness of libraries";^{bz} but it remained for Western Reserve in 1913-14 to feature a course in "the public library and com-

^{bo} See refs. 433, 435, 437.

^{bp} See refs. 434, 436.

^{bq} See ref. 361.

^{br} See ref. 361.

^{bs} See refs. 97, 98.

^{bt} See ref. 301.

^{bu} See ref. 32.

^{bv} See ref. 362.

^{bw} See ref. 363.

^{bx} See ref. 365.

^{by} See ref. 367.

^{bz} See ref. 110.

munity welfare,"^{ca} and for the Carnegie Library School to give concentrated attention to the relation between the public library and the public schools.^{cb} Again, "library extension" had been provided for in 1887,^{cc} but probably on no such scale as it was presented later at several schools, notably Wisconsin^{cd} and New York State itself.^{ce} Finally, the term "consulting librarians," as hidden away under the heading "reading and aids" in the first Columbia circular,^{cf} presumably represented a modest type of instruction in ways of dealing with the reading public, as compared with the consideration of the work of the readers' adviser now common.^{cg} All this is quite over and above the general spread of certain minor items covered in the beginning, notably the survey of the library field and, as time passed, of the growth of the American library movement.

Of the genuine additions to the curriculum since the earliest years some consist in the remedying of oversights, while others represent response to changed conditions or new conceptions in library work. It was a matter of course that Pratt presently should be devoting increased time to the study of government publications,^{ch} and that New York State should have announced in its senior schedule for 1911-12 work in the making of a community survey.^{ci} There was more significance in the new provision for meeting the interests of individuals and of groups, the most powerful impulse toward which came from the need for children's and school librarians. This took several forms, as is illustrated in the definite variations and extensions of the curriculum treated in Chapter VII of this volume.

Such other matter as has crept into the curriculum here and there is ancillary, and of interest chiefly because it has gained a place in spite of being subordinate. For example, in

^{ca} See ref. 389.

^{cb} See refs. 96, 98.

^{cc} See ref. 110.

^{cd} See refs. 454, 455, 456.

^{ce} See ref. 284.

^{cf} See ref. 110.

^{cg} See refs. 119, 170, 244.

^{ch} See ref. 25.

^{ci} See refs. 35, 283.

some cases the administration of county libraries, as a distinct variant of public-library management, has received separate recognition,^{ci} as has also library service to blind readers. Again, at the World-War period a few schools planned study looking toward camp- and hospital-library service.^{ck} Local interests in some instances have claimed attention, namely, in the course at California State having to do with the library law, the county-library system, and the care of the historical material of the home state,^{cl} and in that at the University of Toronto on Canadian literature.^{cm} Finally, there have been admitted at some points marginal subjects and bodies of matter, notably story-telling, psychology,^{cn} public speaking,^{co} parliamentary law,^{cp} and current sociological material.^{cq}

In length the curriculum has continued to fit the single academic year, being sometimes concentrated and again distributed over two or more years of a college quadrennium. Theoretically at least this has held for the schools offering advanced study as well as for others, it being intended that their elementary work should fit students adequately to secure and retain positions even though their further programs might be deemed essential for complete equipment. The precise length of the academic year came under scrutiny when the Association of American Library Schools and the Board of Education for Librarianship set up their standards;^{cr} this may have resulted in some adjustments at schools connected with public libraries, but those associated with teaching institutions generally have continued to be governed in practice by their respective college, university, and institute calendars. Some of the factors which might affect the length of the curriculum, and which doubtless have influ-

^{ci} See refs. 93, 241, 245.

^{ck} See refs. 93, 428.

^{cl} See refs. 92, 93.

^{cm} See ref. 420.

^{cn} See ref. 96.

^{co} See ref. 93.

^{cp} See refs. 97, 454.

^{cq} See ref. 455.

^{cr} See refs. 10, 60.

enced the schools in their decisions regarding it, are discussed in later chapters of this volume.

It has been stated that, in spite of efforts to arrange its items in order, the curriculum in the beginning years tended to be scrappy in form. This condition underwent no early change. It is true that course descriptions, as contrasted with and supplementary to mere grouped lists of components, appeared at the start in Columbia College and quite early at Drexel, Armour, and Illinois;^{cs} and that in the process of dropping some of its twenty-eight subjects and adding twenty-one others between 1895 and 1908 Pratt tried a number of experiments in classifying its matter.^{ct} However, in 1903 the American Library Association Committee on Library Training urged the simplifying of nomenclature and the assembling of topics under a few instead of "thirty to forty" headings;^{cw} in 1912 an American Library Association conference speaker referred to one school as teaching forty-three subjects;^{cx} the report made by Williamson for the Carnegie Corporation revealed the persistence of this general state of things as late as 1921;^{cw} and in 1924 a committee of the Association of American Library Schools still thought it necessary to urge improvement in organization.^{cx} Eventually these influences, aided perhaps by the suggested curricula of the Board of Education for Librarianship and certainly by several newly acquired university affiliations, led to more systematic arrangement. What remains to be done waits less upon the mechanics of shaping the curriculum than upon reasonably precise conclusions as to its staple and standard features; following which there may emerge plans of structure which can command wide acceptance.

Agencies other than library schools continued into the period here under consideration, notably the training and

^{cs} See refs. 110, 155, 408.

^{ct} See refs. 301, 313, 317, 318.

^{cw} See ref. 30.

^{cx} See ref. 194.

^{cw} See ref. 447.

^{cx} See ref. 66.

apprentice classes.^{cy} The programs of these came to appear brief and scant in comparison with the curriculum of the library schools, partly because they retained a high proportion of practical work. Moreover, they aimed mainly in each case to teach the processes of a particular library,^{cz} and often to prepare for the less definitely professional activities in that; for instance, probably it is fair to say that they stressed the routines of the circulation desk and order department as contrasted with the drafting of budgets, and sought to acquaint students with the character and uses of a typical book collection rather than with the range of principles relevant to its assembling. Their standards also were variable, due to the changes within libraries which governed individual classes, and to the diverse practices among libraries which influenced them as a group.^{da} Probably they have not affected the library-school curriculum materially, their position having been apart and that of an expedient where meager resources, or immature conceptions, or low standards have characterized library work. With the lessening of these conditions their place seems questionable.^{db} Presumably the libraries of the future are to need staffs better prepared than any which training or apprentice classes can provide.

The original form of summer session in library methods, inaugurated at Albany in 1896, spread widely.^{dc} As copied eventually at numerous centers throughout the United States, notably under the auspices of state library commissions, it exhibited a fairly uniform six-week program.^{dd} The occasion for it, however, as well as that for training and apprentice classes, has been reduced by advancing standards and by the apparent over-supply of librarians beginning shortly after 1930. The significant summer teaching has

^{cy} See refs. 30, 306, 385.

^{cz} See ref. 343.

^{da} See ref. 40.

^{db} See refs. 85, 359.

^{dc} See refs. 15, 30, 306, 378.

^{dd} See refs. 39, 41, 227.

come to be that reproducing the basic courses in the library-school curriculum proper, which originated at Illinois in 1919^{de} and has been provided elsewhere since 1927.^{df}

Instruction by extension methods enjoyed a short life under auspices of the University of Chicago in 1896-97;^{dg} and the facilities for correspondence study long planned but not supplied by the New York State Library School finally became available,^{dh} being brought to their fullest development by Gaylord Brothers^{di} and the School of Library Service at Columbia University.^{dj} Finally, the fragmentary and detached courses for intending librarians which had appeared by 1903 in normal schools and colleges have become common since then.^{dk} Neither of these types of preparation has proved significant for the curriculum. It is a matter of concern to librarians, however, to see that college programs in library methods shall cease to be segmentary and isolated, and that they shall conform to accepted lines in preparation for librarianship. This might end automatically some unmatured and ill-equipped enterprises, a result wholly desirable both from the viewpoint of curriculum standards and because there promises in the future to be no lack of candidates willing to spend an entire year of study in preparation for library work.

Recapitulating, the library-school curriculum of today is a reflection of beliefs as to what library work comprises and the product of experiment and experience stretching from 1887 to the present. That its making has been feasible at all is due to features already indicated as obtaining generally throughout library work, and to the existence, despite accompanying elements of diversity, of enough libraries of a few homogeneous types to assure a reasonably large common denominator of practice. Without these circumstances

^{de} See refs. 41, 207, 403. ^{dh} See refs. 30, 41, 42, 428. ^{dj} See refs. 116, 204.

^{df} See refs. 15, 118, 416. ^{di} See refs. 6, 56.

^{dk} See refs. 30, 46, 171, 340.

^{dg} See ref. 355.

there would have been insufficient core for a program of instruction; and the fact that conversance with some field of knowledge often composes much of a librarian's equipment, together with the prevalent supposition that the techniques he needs can be acquired with slight effort, might have precluded attempts to formulate a separate discipline. As a matter of history, library-school faculties have had little difficulty in putting together a basic curriculum that, while often crude in its form, complements academic preparation satisfactorily; possesses relatively high solidarity; has proved acceptable as an introduction to library work and adequate as a foundation for further professional study;^{d1} and the chief criticisms of which have sprung from failure to recognize that the schools must meet a variety of needs rather than any one alone.

^{d1} See ref. 170.

OUTLINES OF THE CURRICULUM

THE questions which arose in the framing of the early curriculum largely repeat themselves today, with some additions. Where a curriculum is to be drafted, the components must be selected and assigned their positions and emphasis; and this in a manner that will reflect usage and satisfy practitioners. It must be given such form and organization as will answer the purposes in view. In all of this the original procedures still have a place, although modified by fresh applications and supplemented by new knowledge and devices.

The decisions to be taken in shaping a curriculum for a given school, as treated in Chapter VI, presuppose some outlining of the matter and processes pertinent to librarianship. The resulting schedule supplies a framework within or around which to build; it helps to keep the possible ingredients in view and in order; and it safeguards perspective when attention must be centered upon narrow aspects of the instructional scheme or upon fresh evidence and developments affecting it. The more inclusive it is of the various types of library work, the more useful and dependable it is likely to be as a guide.

Evidently there still is desirable as a beginning the occupational inventory for which the founders of the early library schools groped, together with a list of instructional topics derived from it. These still have not been evolved in definitive form; partly because library work defies sharp description, and partly because it and its aims have not undergone the necessary analysis. Moreover, while the discussion and

study of the affairs undertaken by librarians in recent decades have yielded typical sections of the data desired, not enough has been done to arrange and complete these results. What is practicable so far is to schematize library work under its major headings, then to subdivide these and to extract and array the elements suitable for presentation formally to students. The following brief schedule, which is essentially functional, illustrates the first of these steps.

ACTIVITIES ENTAILED IN LIBRARY WORK

1. Fashioning a library collection, which means:
 - (a) Choosing material to be added or discarded, including books, sets, serial publications, periodicals, and other printed or graphic matter; a process consisting essentially in evaluation, contemplating on the one hand the material and on the other its possible uses, conducted according to accepted procedures
 - (b) Acquiring material by purchase, solicitation, or exchange; entailing employment of bibliographical tools, dealing with sources of supply, and practice of the necessary business methods and office routines
2. Organizing and caring for a library collection, which involves:
 - (a) Keeping a permanent business registry of items added, if required
 - (b) Making and maintaining a catalogue as a means of rendering the collection serviceable; having in mind the nature and needs of the expected clientele and the particular system of cataloguing best adapted to that clientele and to the books
 - (c) Arranging and disposing a collection with the help of such equipment and devices as are appropriate
 - (d) Maintaining a collection, involving such surveillance and steps as are necessary to detect losses and to prevent depreciation
 - (e) Supervising, through an appropriate system and records, the borrowing and return of books by readers

- (f) Providing whatever physical materials are essential to organizing and caring for the collection
3. Using a library collection, an operation which consists of:
 - (a) Supplying information to individuals and organizations, either upon or in anticipation of request, or with respect to known interests; through recourse to sources either directly or by way of indexes, bibliographies, and other keys
 - (b) Choosing and recommending material to individuals and groups, after consultation—a process representing the intermediary function of librarians in its most genuine form
 - (c) Preparing patrons, by means of occasional or systematic instruction, to secure for themselves desired information and material
4. Directing a library enterprise, which implies:
 - (a) The librarian's share (1) in fixing for a library its legal place and constitution; (2) in establishing it; (3) in governing it; (4) in securing support; (5) in providing and caring for its building and property generally; (6) in determining the reach and nature of its activities
 - (b) Responsibility (1) for dividing and allocating to a staff the work of a library; (2) for directing personnel; (3) for recording and presenting results; (4) for maintaining whatever business system is required; (5) for relating resources and effort to those of other libraries; (6) for studying community needs and conditions; (7) for stimulating the use of a library by its clientele

The foregoing embodies the raw material of the curriculum, in outline if not in fullness and symmetry. It may be translated into instructional subjects with whatever amplification and refinement are useful or feasible in a given case. The roll below is a specimen, and exhibits incidentally that shift toward a systematic arrangement which is conducive to compactness, coherence, and the convenient dimensioning of teaching units:

SUBJECTS OF INSTRUCTION, AS INDICATED BY THE ACTIVITIES
ENTAILED IN LIBRARY WORK

1. Selection of library stock, or evaluation both for adding and for discarding; including study of the pertinent material, tools, and methods. Specifically, this means attention to:
 - (a) The needs and tastes of a potential library clientele, and the means of gauging them; having reference both to complete communities and to such component groups as children, teachers, students, foreign-born persons, blind persons, business men, specialists, club-members
 - (b) The criteria which govern the suitability of particular books for given uses and situations, viz.: (1) subject, scope, presentation, authorship, authenticity, and inherent social, literary and scientific merits; (2) form, typography, illustrations, apparatus, editions, publishers; (3) obtainability, including costs both to secure and to retain
 - (c) The available printed aids, notably book reviews, book notes, and book lists (with some reference to subject bibliographies and other tools which may be treated in fulness elsewhere)
 - (d) The administrative machinery for choosing and discarding books, including its dependence upon clientele and staff
 - (e) Such reading or overviews as may be necessary to illustrate the criteria of evaluation and to give readiness for using them; ranging, according to students' prior preparation, from that of typical books to surveys of regional literature or of world literature, and to extensive cultivation of such fields as those of fiction and children's books
2. Trade and national bibliography; involving study of those compilations of information about books which deal chiefly with the conditions and media of their publication; together with attention to the book market, to the agencies operating in it, and to the possible sources of gifts and of acquirement by exchange
3. Acquisition methods; consisting of the adaptation of a purchasing system to library needs and materials, plus attention

to the techniques of soliciting and acknowledging gifts, making exchanges, and disposing of discarded items

4. Cataloguing, or study of:

- (a) Theories, principles, and methods of classification, and comparison of available schemes
- (b) Possible catalogue forms (i.e., slip, book, card, sheaf, author, subject, classified) and the advantages and disadvantages of each
- (c) Principles and methods of catalogue entry
- (d) Rules for subject headings
- (e) Assignment of book numbers
- (f) Making a shelf list
- (g) Assembling and maintaining a catalogue
- (h) Cataloguers' aids, tools, and materials
- (i) Techniques involved in co-operative cataloguing

5. Methods, records, and materials; embracing instruction in the divers lesser processes and particulars incident to organizing and caring for a collection, viz.:

- (a) Accession records (where necessary apart from purchase accounts and from a catalogue)
- (b) Mechanical treatment of new matter
- (c) Placing and keeping material on shelves and in files
- (d) Inventories
- (e) Cleaning the materials of a collection
- (f) Repairing of books
- (g) Simple binding
- (h) Operations pertaining to binding proper, e.g., preparation of books, specifying of materials and methods, and maintenance of relevant records
- (i) Charging systems
- (j) Purchase and care of supplies
- (k) Use of mechanical devices

6. Reference books and reference work, or study of:

- (a) Major divisions into which knowledge falls and the literatures relating to them, including notably the materials under (b) and (c) below
- (b) Library materials generally as reference sources, e.g., histories; biographies; travel records; treatises; gov-

- ernment publications; society publications; journals; periodicals; pamphlets; clippings; pictures; fiction
- (c) Tools specifically designed for reference use, e.g., dictionaries; encyclopedias; compendiums; atlases; handbooks; indexes; concordances; subject bibliographies
- (d) Methods of rendering reference service, e.g., interviews with inquirers; procedures in searching; use of extra-library resources; recording results of search; keeping clients apprised of new material relevant to their interests; preparation of reference lists and bibliographies
- 7. Guidance of readers, with attention to:
 - (a) Ascertaining interests and needs
 - (b) Evaluating books according to the principles relevant in fashioning the collection as a whole, but with reference to individuals and small groups
 - (c) Planning for readers, including selection of titles, preparation of outlines, and drafting of lists, notes, and annotations
 - (d) Advising readers
 - (e) Collaborating with persons and agencies concerned with the guidance of readers, e.g., parents, teachers, and sponsors of effort toward adult education
 - (f) Published aids useful in guidance
 - (g) Office machinery and records incidental to guidance
- 8. Teaching the use of books and libraries in several aspects, i.e.:
 - (a) To children, as they visit the children's room
 - (b) To school pupils, as they are brought in classes to the public library
 - (c) To school pupils, as a part of the work of the school library
 - (d) To college and university students
 - (e) To the faculties of schools, colleges, and universities
 - (f) To the general public
- 9. Administration of libraries, or study of:
 - (a) Specific facts, precedents, and practices concerned with the following:
 - County and city government
 - Library laws

- Institutional backgrounds and management
- Procedures in establishing libraries
- Control and oversight; and respective duties of librarians and governing bodies
- Financing and budgeting
- Buildings and equipment, including funding, planning, construction, maintenance, insurance, and care
- Determining and locating service points
- General principles of organization and administration
- Organizing into divisions, departments, branches, and other agencies, and administering the same
- Directing a staff, i.e., selecting, assigning, instructing, supervising, co-ordinating, leading; and providing favorable working environment
- Rules and regulations
- Statistics
- Reports
- Accounts
- Administration of a library office
- Division of the field of purchase and service among libraries
- Inter-library loans
- Co-operative cataloguing
- Surveying communities and institutions with reference to library functions
- Contacts with communities, leaders, and officials
- Means for encouraging use of a library, i.e., story hours, lectures, exhibits, club facilities, printed helps and explanations, and express publicity devices
- Publishing for a library, including preparation of copy, and drafting of specifications for printing, editing, and proofreading
- Oral presentation
- (b) General considerations bearing upon the above, viz.:
 - History of libraries in pre-modern times
 - Modern library development, including spread, exemplifications, and hypotheses
 - Representative libraries of today

- Current trends in library work and practice, and current happenings among libraries and librarians
- Agencies, other than libraries, contributing to the present-day library movement, viz., library associations, library schools, library periodicals, library commissions
- Government and public administration in relation to library work
- Sociology and its bearing upon library work
- Education and its significance for librarians
- Functions of libraries of various types
- Place and relationships of libraries in communities and organizations
- Psychological factors in library work
- Relations among readers, books, and libraries
- Applications of library principles and practices to public libraries, to the libraries of schools, colleges, and universities, to the libraries of institutions, corporations, and governments, and to restricted sections of work within these groups; also to work with particular classes of people
- Library extension
- Co-ordination of library resources and services
- Nation-wide library coverage
- Norms and standards affecting the organization and administration of libraries
- Equipment needed by librarians
- Status and conditions of librarians
- Professional attitudes, etiquette, and ethics
- 10. History and production of books, involving attention to:
 - (a) Origins of written records
 - (b) Development of writing
 - (c) Invention and spread of printing
 - (d) Present-day book making, including printing, binding, and the materials and processes of both

As already implied, the above is not finished in detail but is drawn to indicate outlines. It might be particularized at some length by any person thoroughly familiar with library

work. For example, under the caption of trade and national bibliography there is suggested the study of copyright law and practice and of tariff regulations governing the importation of books; and in connection with acquisition methods, attention to various kinds of office records and to devices for noting the receipt and holdings of periodicals. On the other hand, the itemizing eventually becomes difficult and subject to difference of opinion; since knowledge is lacking, for instance, to indicate what range of matter should be included in a course in reference books and reference work, and how far instruction in the administration of libraries should extend afield to the specific procedures of management as such, or down to the level of routines. It is to remove such uncertainties and to preclude oversights that systematic inquiries are necessary. Besides being incomplete, the scheme shown is without significance as to arrangement; for the form of such a register properly may vary with the views of those drafting it. Its value is that it suggests the boundaries for a curriculum, at least as concerns matter which is peculiar to library work in application.

That a comprehensive schedule is sound as a standard of reference is evident when omissions or additions are proposed. On the one hand, the rejection of major items seems hazardous, even where emphasis upon particular types of preparation is intended. Library work as yet is not sharply sectioned, in spite of trends in that direction. Students often gravitate to types of activity which they and their advisers cannot foresee; and, even if they enter the fields they contemplate, may assume in the course of their careers wide varieties of duties. Probably most library-school graduates find use at some time for practically all the matter which would appear in the conventional inventory. Sometimes this happens in unexpected fashion, witness the asset which a knowledge of children's literature has proved to be even to

the librarian of a business house.^a Such facts as these doubtless account for the solidarity the basic curriculum has preserved, for they weigh heavily with faculties, however strong the impulse to cast loose from tradition, and however adequate the facilities for meeting curriculum problems in new and supposedly precise ways.

On the other hand, such a scheme is not enlarged easily in scope, since it already is inclusive beyond the time usually available for the curriculum. Inquiry is fair, however, whether it is as broad as library work demands, and possibly whether any schedule based upon library activities alone can be adequate. The possible additions fall under two heads. There are first the liberal studies, whose exclusion in the early period was not as final as may have appeared. They have persisted in a measure at some schools through the incorporation with courses in book selection of what is referred to as "book appreciation," and of surveys of literature and examination of representative publications class by class. This can be only a gesture at best, since knowledge as represented in print is unrestricted and expanding. The fact it betokens, however, namely, that library-school graduates as a group never have overtaken the demands for familiarity with books made upon them by their employers and by the public, in reality has kept open the question of retaining liberal studies. Even if the early decision to omit such studies was sound, it might be incorrect for a generation in which librarians increasingly are expected not merely to manipulate certain tools but to be thoroughly at home with the subjects those tools treat, if not authorities concerning them. Without furnishing a full solution, present-day needs are recognized in the statement long included in announcements of the University of Washington Library School to the effect that of the two sections of the intending librarian's preparation,

^a See ref. 168.

namely, the general and the technical, the general is of the "larger significance";^b and in the practice at the Department of Library Science at the University of Michigan of having students continue throughout their library-school year study in some field emphasized in their undergraduate programs, even though it can be pursued only in a very limited way.^c

The other potential accessions to the schedule are the so-called peripheral topics. The components of this group have been subject to change; witness that commercial bookkeeping, whatever its position in the past, is viewed nowhere today as sufficiently relevant for inclusion, and that handwriting and typing now are regarded as elementary accomplishments which may need to be insisted upon but which should not be taught in a library school. Probably the items conceded the best claims at present are the attainments and forms of knowledge useful in dealing with constituencies, such as oral presentation and ways of directing public relations; the techniques necessary in handling data, examples of which are statistical methods and graphic devices; and certain subjects which are indispensable for particular forms of library work and not easily pursued elsewhere, notably story-telling, report writing, abstracting, and the making of indexes for individual books about to be published.

Granting that both liberal studies and peripheral subjects are of importance, the question is whether or not they should be admitted to the inventory and considered for the basic curriculum. An entirely tenable answer is that time forbids; that an academic year, as the period ordinarily assumed for the curriculum, can contain nothing beyond the desiderata; and that library schools in their way are as handicapped as are schools of medicine and of dentistry in providing for anything beyond the most fundamental matter. This should not be regarded as final, for with the pressure from without

^b See ref. 422.

^c See refs. 75, 414.

so real, compression or telescoping of the curriculum core may well be an object of constant effort by faculties;^d but in the light of field conditions its force for the present is all but compelling, and any additions within the range of possibility would be scant and superficial. Moreover, if a genuine opening could be made for additional subjects, there would arise the question of what specific ones to select. The imaginable branches are numerous, and in subject fields the interests of particular students and groups of students are diversified and unforeseeable. Any scheme seeking to accommodate all the cases that might present themselves probably would carry library schools beyond their province, and would be likely to lack design and coherence.

In the light of the foregoing, therefore, and without closing the door for all time to the introduction of liberal and peripheral studies, it seems reasonable to restrict the instructional inventory to matter clearly peculiar to library work. This does not preclude the offering of subjects not strictly intrinsic when there is demonstrated need for them. It does not prevent filling minor gaps through extracurricular means, as the New York State Library School once provided for training in public speaking by encouraging student clubs^e and as law schools sometimes meet a similar want by organizing moot courts. It need not bar even the crediting of arts and science courses, up to a moderate minimum, if and when abridgments in the main curriculum give leeway for this. Most particularly, it should not stand in the way of substitutions from other disciplines, where students can establish by examination the right to exemption from prescribed courses. It does recognize the inescapable fact, however, that any additions devised must be inconsiderable and largely symbolic.

There is, of course, the possibility of expanding the curriculum to make room for liberal and peripheral studies. In

^d See ref. 73.

^e See ref. 278.

form this happens where library schools function as departments of undergraduate colleges, as has been exemplified in a few cases; and as would follow if a library school, after the manner of some colleges of engineering, should erect about itself a four-year program embodying all the elements of academic instruction which could enter into the preparation of intending practitioners. Such plans, however, seem not generally practicable; and the ends they contemplate, including that of pointing all the undergraduate work toward professional application, should be attainable through prerequisites. It is understood, of course, that for students able to invest more than a single year beyond the acquirement of an arts or science degree, the need for supplementary matter is met by those extensions which differentiate an advanced curriculum from a basic one.

As affecting the scope of the instructional schedule or of the curriculum, only the inclusion of topics is in question here, and not their fullness of treatment. Even though a given list of items should be accepted generally, this would imply nothing necessarily as to the amount of attention due each. There is a wide spread, for example, between the full range of bibliographical sources potentially serviceable in selecting books and those for which there is time in an elementary program; and, again, between the many facts and principles pertinent in the planning of library buildings and those with which most practitioners need to be familiar. How extensively to present particular subjects can be answered only through detailed study of field requirements, and through consideration of the adjustments possible within the basic curriculum, and between this and the extensions to it, which are discussed in Chapters VI and VII of this volume.

V I

ADAPTING THE CURRICULUM

WHEN an instructional program is to be planned for a given school, the curriculum ceases to be viewed as a generic thing. It must be adapted in specific ways to meet conditions, this involving the determination of its content and length, the proportioning and interrelating of its components, and the adoption of a suitable form. As background for all this some consideration of objectives and of approach is prerequisite.

To begin with, selection or recognition is assumed of the field to be served. This may include reference to geographical areas, although these ordinarily exert little effect upon the curriculum since most varieties of library work are likely to be represented in any region wide enough to support a library school. Whether to plan with regard to particular types of library activity or libraries is likely to be a more live question. It may seem desirable to stress the preparation of cataloguers, or of workers notably qualified for positions in public libraries; or, on the other hand, deliberately to avoid emphasis in any one direction and to equip students equally for all divisions of practice. Again, as was true in the early days and as recent tendencies suggest anew, preference may be in order between turning out general assistants and fitting candidates for posts of responsibility.^a Such a choice is open in a measure to all schools, even though, as implied by Bishop,^b its significance is not confined to the basic curriculum.

In adapting the curriculum various factors may enter into

^a See ref. 28.

^b See ref. 75.

the decision to have in view chiefly a given area of library work. A school's existence or financial support may be dependent upon its acceptance of a particular function. The supposed market for its product or the claims put forth by a section of the profession may be compelling. Its choice may be predetermined by peculiarities in its own equipment, by the sources of recruiting, by the kind of applicants available, or by the presence or absence in its territory of other agencies of education for librarianship. Finally, it may be governed by systematic study of the responsibilities which graduates are likely to face after they have gone to their posts.

It has been suggested that the selection of field may entail considering the level of work contemplated, which involves in turn the distinctions among types of vocational preparation reviewed in Chapter X of this volume. Perhaps the most significant form in which the issue arises, is whether to concentrate upon specific tasks and operations and upon the formulae useful in performing them, or, rather, to have in mind the range and permutations of librarians' duties, together with the need for giving students reasoned and comprehensive equipment from which to draw varying applications. Although related to the teaching, as well as to the curriculum, its solution plays a part in settling what items to draft from the instructional list, and how to dispose them. In the planning for individual subjects the answer may indicate in a course in cataloguing whether certain preferred methods are to be stressed or variants introduced liberally; whether a course in classification is to be confined to the mechanics of a single system or to be built upon principles and illustrated from diverse schemes; whether a course in reference books and reference work is to comprise a profusion of detail or to aim at such an introduction and overview as will put students on the path of growing effectiveness in handling tools. It may also control the extent to which

difficulties and peculiarities in procedure are to be given prominence.

Some aspects of the curriculum in any given case depend also upon whether the aim is to make the instruction functional or what might be called systematic. If functional, the curriculum will present library work in the guise of a few major activities such as cataloguing and book selection, drawing under the appropriate headings all the topics which contribute in any way to them and treating every one primarily with reference to its entire division. The advantages claimed for this plan are that it provides a picture of each large area of work as a unit, delineating sharply the whole and the place of the parts in the whole, and that it conditions students to the assignments they are most likely to receive in libraries. If, alternatively, the curriculum is systematic, it will stress individual subjects and processes and their grouping by some kind of likeness to each other. This claims warrant on the grounds that since many topics and procedures have more than one application, to treat them independently or with their kin obviates duplication and assures the greatest order, economy, and thoroughness in presentation; and that since commonly there is no way of knowing in what sections of library work graduates will begin their careers, they will be able to apply their instruction most intelligently if it is not bound up closely with a preconceived plan of departmentalization or performance. All this comports with the expectation, appropriate in a professional school, that students will be capable of their own adaptations and syntheses, even of disjunct matter. Additionally, the systematic plan accords with the recognition of levels in library work.

In deciding whether to construct its curriculum functionally or systematically, a faculty may consider whether to give it a logical or a psychological complexion. There has

been confusion in the use of these terms, but the defensible view seems to be that a logical scheme is one resting upon an abstract collocation of matter; whereas a psychological plan seeks accommodation to the interests, capacities, and mental reactions of the students who are to deal with it. If these definitions be accepted, the choice between logical and psychological arrangements means more in relation to the substance within courses than to the curriculum as a whole, and more for the class presentation than for either. Too many factors are involved to permit close adherence throughout the curriculum to one of these plans as against the other, among them being the reasons for functional disposition discussed in the paragraph preceding; whereas in any single course it is simple both to elect and to adhere to a desired grouping of items. Again, it may make comparatively little difference which theory is followed in constructing the curriculum; for example, assuming proper prerequisites, a course in government publications might fall satisfactorily in any one of several connections with other courses, whereas its effectiveness might depend very much upon whether it began with the study of governments and of issuing offices or with the handling of useful and interesting pamphlets. Finally, even if a course is logical in pattern the treatment given its components in class from day to day may be psychological, and generally should be so.

The preliminary determinations suggested above influence largely the features of the curriculum in a given case. The content is the first thing to be considered in the actual drafting. It is here mainly that an instructional inventory of the type set forth in Chapter V is helpful, and several steps are involved in its use. To begin with, lines can be drawn showing which of its parts are to be included and which excluded, and whether any of the liberal studies or peripheral subjects are to be embraced. Any faculty might hold, for example,

that time is insufficient or that the period is past for putting into its curriculum some items appearing in a schedule derived from library activities. Again, a school which expects to locate many of its graduates in college and university libraries might incorporate some subjects, such as college finances, which would not be taught at other institutions, and ignore a few, such as the administration of a children's room, which would be emphasized elsewhere. Similar conclusions might obtain where preparation for work on a single level or under a particular type of library organization is to be stressed. All this is more pertinent the more the inventory is particularized, and is apt to be increasingly so as the various forms of library work are differentiated more sharply, and as it becomes easier to discern just how much there is in common among them.

When or before the boundaries of the curriculum are established, it may be an aid to elaborate further whatever divisions of the instructional inventory are to be admitted, noting in detail their items. This is desirable as a means of catching all the possible components; it offers opportunity for analytical procedures; and it permits probably as much refinement as is applicable to the inventory method. It is valuable in making further delimitations, these being necessary within, as well as among, subjects. If employed without too much reference to past practice it should enable a faculty to escape with some success from its preconceptions and habits of thought, and to start afresh.

With the prospective matter of the curriculum fully broken down it may be allocated to compartments, to accord on the one hand with the aims and principles adopted for the school concerned, and on the other hand with the framework contemplated. These may take the form of units or blocks, more or less movable and interchangeable, which finally are to constitute the curriculum structure. An ad-

vantage of keeping the elements quite separate at the start, however, is that they then may be treated on their individual merits, and more in relation to subjects than to courses. It may be advantageous to continue viewing them in this way; for if comprehensive examinations and the innovations they make possible should be adopted generally by library schools, the basis of instruction would be less the course than the subject. Incidentally, the detailing of components is necessary as a basis for the syllabi ordinarily used in connection with comprehensive examinations.

The length of the curriculum might seem hardly subject to option, so far has the single academic year been taken for granted. The early library schools considered the question open, however, as does some opinion today;^c and throughout library-school history there have been substantial reasons for avoiding final conclusions regarding it. On the one hand, the span of the curriculum could not be decided precisely without authoritative prescription as to its substance, the lack of which has been mentioned. On the other hand, there never has been demonstration that the common academic year corresponds fairly to the rewards in prospect for practitioners or to their professional expectations. Since the matter to be presented and the returns to be anticipated by learners should govern the period of preparation, and since schooling, of whatever thoroughness, can constitute only an introduction to the field with which it deals, there is no great significance either in the conventional length of the curriculum, or in the difficulty of fitting instruction to it which faculties often have deplored. What is of central importance is to suit the period to ascertained conditions, and especially not to allow convenience or tradition, by fixing the length of the curriculum, to determine the components and their treatment.

^c See ref. 75.

Bound with the content and length of the curriculum is its internal proportioning, which involves the time and emphasis due the various constituents. Again, norms and the data necessary for them are wanting, beside which the options are innumerable; and although usage among the schools furnishes a rough guidance, the time devoted to some subjects has varied in ratios as great as two to one.^d Even the several "suggested curricula" of the Board of Education for Librarianship,^e although they embody the results of much experience and observation, are not grounded on systematic study of library work and of its instructional implications. Two investigable factors largely should be controlling, viz., the relative importance in practice of the various elements, and the time and effort required for their acquirement. The first of these factors rests upon information as to where students are placed, the organization of work in the libraries to which they go, and the duties which fall to them, all interpreted with reference to conditions among libraries generally and to the responsibilities graduates are likely to bear in later years; the second implies sustained scrutiny of teaching procedures, of student loads and student records, and of the experience of instructors and classes, represented in such studies as should fall naturally within the day's work of faculties and lead incidentally to enhanced efficiency in teaching. The results should lessen the tendency to deposit subjects in whatever course compartments happen to be convenient. While such findings would be valuable throughout the curriculum, they should be notably so as indicating how wide a spread to allow in the hours allotted to topics of comparable moment, such as the acquisition and the cataloguing of books, which embrace, respectively, a few relatively simple processes and a series of exacting ones.

^d See refs. 63, 64, 67, 447.

^e See ref. 10.

Almost as important as the proportioning of the elements of the curriculum is their interrelating. This means, for one thing, fixing their sequence. It is true that a curriculum as brief as that of library schools permits little choice as to the succession in which topics may be presented; and that some support on practical or pedagogical grounds can be adduced for almost any order that may be proposed. However, some subjects preferably are antecedent to others, as is true of trade bibliography in respect to acquisition methods; and some topics may well be juxtaposed, notably reference books and work and subject bibliography. When connections are less obvious, it may be because facts of some kind are lacking or because the postulates of instruction are not clear. For instance, if it is true that inexperienced students can make quicker headway with cataloguing and classification than with other subjects, as was believed when the Columbia school after trial in the early years put these first in point of time,^f this should be demonstrable by data regarding candidates' qualifications and by experiments embracing other divisions of the curriculum. Again, if it is advantageous to familiarize a class with practice before introducing the related theory, or if it is more effective to reverse the order or to schedule the two concurrently, this should be because one of these schemes can be shown to produce most surely a desired combination of technical competence and power to comprehend and adapt. The priority of practical work is supported by the library school at Pratt Institute,^g and is advocated by Mann for schools of engineering^h and by Mays for certain levels of vocational education generally.ⁱ Investigation, however, might help to replace with certainty both these and some contrasting views.

Interrelating the components of the curriculum also entails classifying them, which in fact is likely to be anticipated in

^f See ref. 115.

^g See ref. 325.

^h See ref. 254.

ⁱ See ref. 259.

deriving an instructional inventory. Preconceptions and expediency have played a large part in this in the past, to the neglect of verified principle. For one thing, various kinds of learning are concerned in preparing for library work. While psychologists and authorities on educational method have sundry ways of differentiating and defining types of learning,^j and although they have found no occasion to analyze library-school instruction in the light of these, certainly quite distinct mental operations take place, respectively, in fixing in memory the characteristics of specific reference tools, in understanding a classification scheme, in planning a collection to suit a given clientele, and in evaluating individual books and appraising possible lines of professional conduct. Obviously it is efficient to commingle these forms no more than necessary; and although the conjunction of several of them in certain courses, notably that in book selection, may be as inevitable as it is in a course in English language and literature in a secondary school,^k it need not pervade the curriculum. The arrangement of matter according to varieties of learning, that is, the collection, respectively, of whatever involves knowledge, understanding, problem solving, and appreciation, would add to the homogeneity within courses. Incidentally, it should help to make clear what teaching methods and classroom devices are most appropriate for various subjects.

The classifying of matter also should reflect the choice between functional and systematic programs. For example, if the purpose is to build the curriculum on functional lines the teaching of classification, cataloguing, and subject headings might be consolidated, either as a matter of theory or in recognition of the fact that in many libraries they together make up the duties of individual staff members; and the instruction in reference books and reference work,

^j See refs. 88, 136, 187, 262.

^k See ref. 262.

subject bibliography, and book selection might be combined, in conformity with a type of departmental organization in libraries which seems to be spreading.¹ A possibility also is the union of all that has to do with circulation work so-called; including not only the processes, such as choosing and recommending material to readers and supervising the borrowing and return of books, but also the directional activities, such as the organizing of a circulation department and the administering of the attached personnel. This last scheme, it is worth noting, has the support of one of the textbooks produced under the Library Curriculum Study. If on the other hand a systematic approach is sought, amalgamations might be adopted which would lead, for example, to considering staff management with some completeness at one point, rather than severally in connection with the teaching of circulation work, reference work, cataloguing, and children's work; which would render feasible the covering of library publications once for all, rather than successively in relation to book lists, administrative reports, and printed catalogues; and which would combine the study of the book market with that of trade bibliography, rather than with that of order routines, thus concentrating whatever is relevant to the acquisition of books and other library material. Alternatives similar to those cited above are numerous, and have caused their share of vexation to library-school faculties. Should instruction in book selection, for instance, have associated with it that in trade bibliography, which is one of its tools, and that in acquisition, which is its sequel; or ought it to stand alone? Should the teaching of periodicals and of government publications, respectively, be cast in units blending all the aspects, or should it be distributed to the courses in acquisition, cataloguing, and reference books and reference work? Should the subjects

¹ See refs. 205, 206.

necessary in school-library work be assembled in an elective course or be treated wherever expedient, assuming a curriculum not aimed at specialization? Such questions testify to the value of defining objectives and approach as precedent to arranging the matter of the curriculum.

Indeed, most of the factors which touch the shaping of the curriculum in any way affect the classifying of its contents, although some do so only indirectly. For example, the choice between preparing students for specific and indeterminate tasks weighs either for a functional or systematic organization, as the case may be. If, for instance, the aim is to make sure that upon graduation students are fitted for prescribed procedures, it may seem suitable to treat charging systems in connection with the administration of a loan department, binding records in association with the materials and processes of binding, and the editing of book lists as a part of the work of a readers' adviser; whereas, if the object is to provide the most flexible and adaptable equipment, it may seem more to the point to present these and other techniques as a unified body of routines, susceptible of various applications. Again, whatever proportioning of items has been determined upon is likely to affect their disposition, as suggested by the options arising in the instruction in book selection. The teaching in this subject may be made to include the study of fiction and of children's literature, on the ground that these branches are minor and can be covered adequately so; or it may exclude them, in the belief that their importance requires the erection of separate units. Similarly, the teaching of government publications either may be joined with that of reference books and reference work or set up alone and apart from it.

The proportioning and interrelating of elements in the curriculum leads, under American practice, to the formation of courses, this by way of regularizing the organization and

explaining its parts. Theoretically, these courses should represent in aggregate the decisions reached in adapting the curriculum; actually, they may reflect extraneous circumstances. As an example, the allotment of time to subjects may hinge somewhat upon whether a school is operating on a quarter basis or under a semester plan. Again, if it is desired to assimilate the instruction in book selection to that in reference books and reference work, the proposal may depend upon the extent to which the qualifications for the teaching of both subjects happen to be united in some one member of a faculty. In connection with shaping the scheme, therefore, it may be helpful to examine the arrangements which so far have proved feasible in the various library schools.

When studied groupings of matter began to appear in the early curriculum they took several forms. One consisted in erecting substantial courses about those subjects, perhaps with not too much regard for their basic or comparative importance, which if presented in some completeness would call for major compartments of instruction, and in treating others as detached fragments. Certain so-called "backbone" courses thus came to be recognized, notably those in cataloguing, reference books and work, and book selection, while other topics were treated in bits. According to another plan this loose organization was systematized, although not greatly simplified, by gathering its numerous items under some few comprehensive adjective headings, such as "technical," "bibliographic," and "administrative," without changing them individually. The supposed strength of such a scheme is that, its subdivisions being ostensibly nominal, it leans toward the presentation of library work as an entity; but in spite of this appearance it remains fragmentary. Outstanding examples were furnished by Pratt Institute,^m

^m See ref. 321.

which presumably aimed to place the groups with some regard for an approved sequence, and by Western Reserve University,ⁿ which scheduled them more nearly in concurrence; but comparable instances have existed at the Library School of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta^o (now Emory University Library School), at the University of Wisconsin,^p and at the Library School of the Los Angeles Public Library.^q The remaining arrangement is the familiar one for which university usage has set the pattern, and in which courses of varying but definite weightings are made the blocks, their constituents being either major subjects or aggregations of minor topics. This appeared among library schools first at the University of Illinois,^r and has become almost general, although its acceptance by schools not associated with universities was slow and incomplete.^s Its advantages are that it is orderly and methodical; that it systematizes details, which is imperative where large numbers of students and instructional units are to be handled; that it simplifies records, thus facilitating adjustments within schools and transfers between schools; and that it is an aid in controlling the study loads of pupils and the service loads of faculties. Its faults are that the course weightings sometimes become too rigid and too uniform throughout to suit the matter, and that it may be allowed to over-sharpen the division lines between subjects. For the first of these weaknesses the remedy is to relax and diversify rather than to discard the system. For the second, it consists in various devices, to be discussed below, which in some form should be features of any curriculum.

Courses and their components require captions, and in assigning these lies in part the opportunity to make the curriculum structure intelligible, to convey something of its

ⁿ See ref. 439.

^o See ref. 94.

^p See ref. 457.

^q See ref. 240.

^r See ref. 405.

^s See ref. 66.

content and import, and perhaps to work toward a more nearly common terminology among library schools. Too often in the past the phrases used have been loose and colloquial; and this, besides being bad form, may be one of the reasons the public has failed to understand what is involved in library work and in the preparation for it. The word "reference," for example, is too indefinite to describe a course without a qualification showing that it has to do with books of a particular kind and with the work in a reference room. "Bibliography" has meanings so dissimilar that when standing alone there is no way of telling whether it implies study of the format and associations of books, of the procedures in listing and cataloguing books, or of those books themselves which cite or allude to other books. "Administration" is too often employed to include routines and house-keeping as well as the major aspects of management. And while the term "book selection" perhaps is unavoidable, it is applied both to the study of processes connected with fashioning the library collection and of some entailed in advising readers; whereas to a non-librarian it might connote neither. Satisfactory titles are difficult to achieve for most matter that goes into print; but they may be as significant for a school as for an author, and their choice therefore merits whatever detachment, originality, and sense of precision a faculty can muster. The effort toward a uniform terminology made by the Board of Education for Librarianship in its early years might well be extended by the schools themselves and applied especially to the curriculum.⁴

Finally, whatever arrangement of matter may be adopted should represent as complete co-ordination as possible. One reason for this lies in the facts that students gain by thinking of what is presented to them as a mosaic rather than as a congeries of discrete items; and that, since the graduates of

⁴ See ref. 17.

American colleges are prone to view their work in compartments, not everything can be left to their compounding abilities or even to the efforts of teachers. A student who fails to use in a cataloguing problem relevant tools which happened to be presented to him in connection with the study of book selection may not deserve great sympathy; yet no professional faculty can afford to forget that its courses are artificial, and that if a graduate lacks a unified sense of what they cover, the lines between them may be partly responsible. After boundaries for courses have been set up, therefore, they may need to be dimmed. One way to reduce the partitioning effects is to make the sections of the curriculum few and large. The old technical-bibliographical-administrative classification of matter accomplished this in a measure; and something could be said for reviving its categories to group weighted courses, where these are numerous. Perhaps a franker and more efficacious device is to keep the actual number of courses low, thus giving emphasis to major rather than to minor divisions, and incidentally simplifying class schedules and diminishing the number of examinations; although it must be recognized that as courses increase in content they lessen in homogeneity and clearness, tend to become top-heavy, and either may build up unduly and distribute unevenly the teaching load for the instructors concerned or may come under multiple, and therefore divided, control. The library school at the University of California is notable for the early consolidation of subjects under a minimum number of headings, having listed at one time only "Cataloguing and classification," "Bibliography," "Library administration and extension," and "Study and selection of books"; and in fact it has never departed far from this simple scheme.^u The University of Denver ^v and Emory University ^w have adopted arrange-

^u See refs. 391, 392, 394.

^v See ref. 402.

^w See ref. 170.

ments similar as regards fewness of courses, Denver doing so partly as a means of observing what it views as the functional affinities of course matter.

Various other curriculum measures for helping students to see beyond course lines are utilizable, some of which are domestic to library schools and some of which have been developed elsewhere. The concurrent scheduling of certain subjects, even if adopted primarily to facilitate their learning, may be an example; witness the intention in the courses in book selection and in reference books and work at the College of St. Catherine. Others are the practice at the University of Minnesota of encouraging enough overlapping among courses to show the interdependence of subjects; the "correlation" period placed near the close of the course in library administration at Emory University; and, although it is partly a teaching feature, the plan in operation at the Carnegie Library School of associating a problem in book selection with a term bibliography not included in that course. Comparable instances in professional schools of other kinds are the building of the curriculum at the Yale Divinity School about a few "fields of study," by which department lines are broken and the thinking of students supposedly is made both more comprehensive and less fragmentary;^z the devising of specific machinery for integration, such as certain seminars at Union Theological Seminary^y in New York and at the New York School of Social Work;^z the "honors" arrangements in electrical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology;^{aa} and the Department of Co-ordination which ties up classroom study with the co-operative assignments in industries at the University of Cincinnati College of Engineering and Commerce.^{ab}

The best means of removing the eyes of students and

^z See refs. 460, 461.

^y See ref. 390.

^z See refs. 271, 272.

^{aa} See ref. 185.

^{ab} See refs. 399, 400.

faculty from courses as such is one which depends largely upon practices in the administration of a school, but which, if contemplated at the time of building a curriculum, may check the possible tendency to overemphasize compartments. Assuming such units as are necessary to manage the instruction and to establish controls, it consists in letting their distinctness of character end there, and in disregarding credits for them except as a registrar's device. Under such a plan, when the time comes for evaluating students' readiness to graduate, their capacities and their professional equipment as a whole are weighed, as well as their performance in individual courses. The idea carries difficulties, but is practiced to some extent in library schools, and its improved application is among the aims of the comprehensive examinations planned for the Columbia University School of Library Service. It is attempted at the Harvard Theological School and at the School of Journalism and the College of Engineering at Columbia University.

A second reason for striving to co-ordinate the components of a curriculum is the obligation to exemplify that care in planning which graduates are expected to exhibit in their own work after they go into the field. This is not to urge meticulous organization, which has dangers, but ordinary precaution against cross-purposes, confusion, and waste of time. Library-school faculties sometimes have been inattentive to such needs, evidence of which has been the commonness of unintended and unwarranted duplications. Reiteration has a place in the teaching process, but it should be planned rather than inadvertent. When students discover profitless repetition, they may feel justly that their time is poorly directed. Careful correlation of matter helps to prevent this, which is possible even within courses when they are composite in content or are conducted each by more than one instructor. Regardless of the motives stressed for

co-ordination, its importance is an added reason for starting construction of the curriculum with occupational and instructional inventories, and then breaking these down fully and building from the elements. The framing of syllabi also may be worth while, especially if other uses for them are foreseen.

Numerous adaptations to conditions are inevitable in any library-school curriculum, whatever the aims and assumptions invoked. For one thing, it would be exceptional if a single line of action could be followed with entire consistency. A scheme strictly functional, for example, would be impossible to carry out because it would contain no place for the history of libraries; whereas one rigidly systematic might lack adaptability to actual library practice. Again, accidental factors tend to disturb internal proportioning, as happens sometimes when the experience or predilection of a particular teacher results in undue emphasis being given to his subject; or as would be the case if access to an especially rich collection of government publications occasioned disproportionate attention to such material; or as might be true if a school meaning to make its instruction of general application, nevertheless stressed unduly features of work prominent in its affiliated library. Finally, as has been pointed out in connection with the framing of courses, the circumstances prevailing in any large teaching institution necessarily influence the parts composing it, including a library school if it is present. The length of the year is likely to be predetermined, schedule arrangements may be inflexible, and there even may be set patterns governing the organization and weighting of courses. Conceivably, to fit or to build up a given credit unit it might be necessary, in presenting methods, routines, and materials, to allow less time for instruction in the keeping of library accounts than had been settled upon as desirable; or, in planning the work

in bibliography, to associate the teaching of subject bibliography with that of trade bibliography, even though this was against the judgment of the faculty. Finally, if compromises in the curriculum spring from none of these conditions, they are almost certain to be imposed at times by the budget.

Since each adaptation of the curriculum is assumed to follow the conditions existing in a given case, anything like uniformity among various schools is not to be expected. Moreover, it is debatable how far such agreement would be salutary. Certainly no conventions should be encouraged which would hamper experimentation or revision. On the other hand, there would seem to be insufficient reason for wide diversity as long as the needs of students are predominantly alike and the basic instructional matter relatively staple. Parallelism, at least to the extent of having such courses as those called "Cataloguing" and "Bibliography" stand everywhere for accepted divisions of the field, would aid faculties in dealing with the curriculum and others in understanding it. So also would the similarity of nomenclature which would be apt to ensue, although this might depend in part upon the willingness of libraries to accept a codified terminology for their work generally.

No faculty can afford to overlook that the process of adapting the curriculum, if pursued with thoroughness, involves use of an increasing range of resources. The commonest knowledge about library work may deserve review, in order that all salient conditions may be given due weight. The printed matter representing fifty years of effort and conferring on the problems of library work and of education for it is not to be forgotten; notably, the findings of American Library Association committees, the results of numerous investigations, and the publications of the library schools and of their faculties. Experiments and experience in the

construction and operation of curricula in schools of other kinds offer pertinent lessons. The literature of education for other professions especially merits attention, because of the analogies it furnishes and because library-school faculties have neglected it in the past. In addition to the studies of education for medicine, law, and engineering already cited, that concerned with the fields of medicine and engineering have been supplemented;^{ac} and comparable surveys are at hand dealing with training for teaching,^{ad} for social work,^{ae} for dentistry,^{af} for business,^{ag} for architecture,^{ah} for the ministry,^{ai} and for nursing,^{aj} not to mention various reports, bulletins, and chapters in works dealing with higher education.^{ak}

Assuming full utilization of existing resources, there remain for pursuit by library-school faculties the avenues of investigation referred to in this and preceding chapters. Boyd's effort to build a course in government publications with reference to the value of such material in libraries,^{al} and Akers's attempt to discover in the duties of cataloguers a formula for the teaching of cataloguing,^{am} presumably are as apt examples of this as have appeared so far. Besides revealing facts for the construction of specific courses at a given time, such methods should make it possible to couple improvements in library organization and practice with progressive amendments to the curriculum generally. They suggest also appraisal of the curriculum by studying its correlation with particular forms and sections of library work, and by its actual effects, using as norms the success of graduates and their own judgments upon their preparation. All undertakings of this nature, of course, should be safeguarded from the bias and distortion which may characterize intensive

^{ac} See refs. 68, 178, 370.

^{ad} See ref. 229.

^{ae} See refs. 195, 386, 425.

^{af} See refs. 3, 190.

^{ag} See refs. 79, 256.

^{ah} See ref. 82.

^{ai} See ref. 86.

^{aj} See ref. 131.

^{ak} See refs. 222, 247, 263,
265, 370.

^{al} See ref. 83.

^{am} See ref. 1.

investigation and which notably are hazards in analyzing and evaluating professional procedures. In carrying them out library school faculties enjoy an advantage which builders of curricula in the field of general education sometimes are alleged to lack;^{an} for library schools, like other professional schools, have aims of sufficient definiteness to test their assumptions and results as they go along.

In the numerous decisions and procedures incident to adapting the curriculum, the conditions of library work necessarily are the main guide, and largely may predetermine the path. While it is desirable not to take for granted any particular outcome, it would be difficult to overdraw the importance of following the largest view of library work which is tenable and of interpreting fairly all its claims. Some indication of what this may signify has been attempted in Chapter II of the present volume, notably in relation to enlarged conceptions of service, improved organization, and the use of all relevant knowledge and devices. It implies programs of instruction suiting competent intellects and providing for individual gifts, with attention to processes and routines reduced to a reasonable minimum and with all possible latitude for broadening and deepening the equipment of students. It entails an organization which clears the decks of impediments and nonessentials, and yet confronts learners with the labor and problems indispensable to the attainment of professional stature. Fundamentally, it assumes sedulous concern for the place of libraries and the meaning of library service in communities, in institutions, and in the lives of people.

The library schools are sensing that they can do more in the directions indicated just above than sometimes they have realized, and still not lose step with current field conditions. Without marked innovation in the content, proportioning,

^{an} See ref. 77.

and other basic features of the curriculum, there is possible an approach in framing it which, if followed by comparable measures in the teaching, assures breadth and richness. So many librarians have called for this, and so many graduates have criticized the curriculum as lacking it, that effort to carry it as far as possible seems pressing. The trends in the library field are added arguments for it. The aim involved represents anew the movement away from concentration upon practical processes.

The management of curriculum matter here suggested is pervasive; but a few examples of emphasis, based upon items likely to appear in an instructional inventory, are enough to illustrate its nature and significance. Cataloguing and classification may be dealt with in the guise not so much of methods as of keys to the world of knowledge represented in books. The building and handling of a library collection may be viewed as a problem in the diagnosis and assistance of a clientele, now on a group basis and now individually. The presentation of reference resources and bibliographies may include introduction to the areas of learning and literature with which they deal, and may stress capacity to find ways about in the fields concerned, rather than specific tools. The general organization and administration of libraries may be shown to rest upon principles which have proved valid in conducting comparable enterprises, and upon skill in applying those principles. Procedures, methods, and contrivances may be taken up not as ends in themselves, but as means of service, and with regard to the need they meet and the extent to which they should be developed and utilized. Finally, foundations for correct perspective and grasp of essentials may be laid by giving ample stress to the social and psychological factors which underlie library work, and which should govern both its motives and its procedures. Whatever characteristics the curriculum may take on henceforth, the treatment here

described seems cardinal. Its beginnings are sufficiently evident to give confidence that the schools intend response to the aims and conditions of library work, insofar as these can be defined.

V I I

VARIATIONS, EXTENSIONS, AND ABRIDGMENTS OF THE CURRICULUM

AS suggested in Chapter IV, the solidarity achieved for the curriculum has been observed closely. Belief in the indispensability of the common components, coupled with reluctance to jeopardize the prospects of students by modifying these, has confirmed progressively its contour as marked out in early days. This usually has been true even where faculties have sought to weight their offerings somewhat in favor of particular branches of work, such as that of small public libraries, or cataloguing. Moreover, where time beyond the single academic year has been available, this has been used more often to afford added play for basic subjects than as opportunity for altering or augmenting the content in any radical way.

Customary as it has been to follow a single model, however, conditions in some sectors of library work have prompted experimentation with alternatives. Broadly classified, these have taken three forms, viz., (1) definite variations in the basic curriculum, (2) extensions of it, and (3) abridgments. All three recognize that the requirements of library work are diversified; and that, even if a relatively fixed elementary program serves for a preponderant number of students, it may not meet fully the needs of all or of the profession as a whole for an indefinite time. For example, the familiarity with children's literature and with library work with children necessary for various groups of librarians differs widely; besides which, among those who desire to give particular attention to these subjects, some contemplate only the sim-

pler forms of activity, at least at the start, while others plan for headships of departments and other supervisory positions. Again, discrimination seems reasonable as to the instruction in cataloguing required by candidates for library work, since some need to be fitted for bibliographical cataloguing, some may never be called upon to make more than a simple catalogue, some may use knowledge of cataloguing mainly in administering libraries, while a few even may be sufficiently equipped if they are able to use catalogues skillfully. Finally, differentiations of this nature may be applied in some circumstances to the curriculum in entirety, as well as to its parts. The present chapter aims to examine the divergences from the basic curriculum which, responsive to the several purposes of students, seem to have justified themselves.

Of the variations, that type which appeared earliest and which is most clear-cut consists in building the basic curriculum not in anticipation of library work as a whole, as has been the design generally, but with reference to service in a specific kind of library. It assumes that preparation so pointed should be possible within the period ordinarily allotted to study by beginners, at least as affecting candidates for some positions and as an expedient; and that the advantages of maximum familiarity with a narrowed area of practice outweigh the chances of early location in other fields, and even tend to diminish these. Its possible exemplifications are as numerous as the specialized forms of library activity, but so far it has arisen only in relation to library work with children and in schools. A program of study for prospective children's librarians was devised with the opening in 1901 of the Training School for Children's Librarians at the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh,^a and was paralleled later at Western Reserve University^b and at the St. Louis

^a See refs. 98, 296, 369.

^b See ref. 438.

Library School;^e comparable facilities for school librarians were provided in 1917 at the Pittsburgh school ^d and have become common elsewhere since.^e Both represent answers to defined needs, which in the case of school librarians have been accentuated by an increase of openings and complicated by the relations with the teaching personnel of elementary and secondary schools into which school librarians necessarily are thrown. The problems peculiar to the latter field, as met both by the variations under discussion and by other means of qualifying, are treated in Fargo's study of the preparation of school librarians.^f

Obviously a curriculum which aims to fit students for a single kind of library activity must reflect this purpose in its content. This means, for instance, that if library work with children is anticipated the instruction in classification will emphasize those aspects which relate to a collection of children's books; and, similarly, will introduce courses which have interest almost exclusively to workers with a juvenile clientele, such as the study of home libraries scheduled by the Pittsburgh school at its inception.^g If school-library work is in view, there will be featured in the teaching of reference books and reference work the tools conspicuously useful in school libraries; and, again, there will be offered subjects valuable chiefly to the school librarian, such as the course in adolescent literature which was provided, for example, at North Carolina College for Women.^h In both of these cases there also may be omissions, as judged from the standpoint of the general curriculum; such as that of certain applications of cataloguing, and of the bibliographical sources useful mainly in university and reference libraries. Modifications analogous to these might find counterpart in other directions, notably in such a program as has been urged looking toward

^e See ref. 349.

^d See refs. 99, 100.

^e See refs. 11, 188, 273, 292.

^f See ref. 174.

^g See ref. 96.

^h See ref. 292.

work in business libraries.ⁱ They are the only marked peculiarities of the curriculum forms in question, which forms are derived by the same processes suitable in building the general curriculum.

The other type of variation attempts to distinguish between matter which is uniformly essential and those applications of it which may be presented more effectively in relation to particular forms of library work. Accordingly, while preserving the content of the conventional curriculum, it divides this into (1) prescribed subjects and (2) supplementary and somewhat divergent options. The result is the system of elective courses and sections of courses introduced at several schools in recent years. There are difficulties in the plan, for if the solidarity of the basic curriculum is genuine the line must be hard to draw between the fundamentals and the segments. This is true even if it be granted, for example, that public librarians and college librarians may well view book-selection procedures in different ways, and that not all students require the same amount of instruction in subject bibliography. Moreover, if elective schemes are to be practicable, classes must be large enough to permit sectioning, and schedules are bound to be intricate. Then, too, some students find themselves at a loss in approaching their selections, whether because they know too little of library work to make decisions with intelligence, or because they know enough of it to imagine that by stressing any one side of their study they may be limiting their prospects. Such unreadiness to select options, and perhaps some accompanying inability to make the best use of them, are not confined, it may be noted, to library schools.^j

The difficulties of the elective scheme are not sufficient to discourage its thorough trial, however. It is a simple means of recognizing not only the existing diversities in library

ⁱ See ref. 372.

^j See ref. 128.

work, but the cleavages which develop in it from time to time. It goes further than the more rigid kind of curriculum variation discussed above in that it allows play for personal interests and preferences; and in that, acknowledging individualization to be desirable in professional education as elsewhere, it provides probably as much of this as the work in libraries warrants. Incidentally, it permits a latitude greater than is feasible in schools of medicine and dentistry, although less than is possible in schools of divinity and of social work. It does this without forcing commitment to a given field, and without prejudice to placement wherever suitable opportunity may offer; since its programs are not narrowed enough to handicap the student who, for example, has followed a college-library option and then is attracted by an opening in a special library. It takes account of migratory movements from section to section of library work, such as that from the public library to the school library, which Fargo^k adduces as having been common. Finally, through compelling consideration of various avenues of preparation, it renders students somewhat more conscious of conditions among libraries than otherwise they might be.

The preferential arrangements practicable in library schools include some which are not strictly curricular; such as those at the Universities of Denver and of North Carolina whereby classes pursuing common courses are divided into groups representing libraries of several types, the assignments and consultations for each group then being pointed in the appropriate direction, and the class hours being used to co-ordinate results and to reconcile disparities. Elective schemes proper, however, rest upon distinctly organized courses, and are of two kinds. In one the units appear to have no necessary connection with each other, whether they be few as at the New Jersey College for Women,^l or rela-

^k See ref. 174.

^l See refs. 266, 267.

tively numerous, as has been the case at McGill University.^m In the other, embodying necessarily a considerable range of courses, these are clustered with reference to definite divisions of library work. The school at Syracuse University supplies an example of this, with a "Public or college library sequence" and a "Children or school library sequence";ⁿ as does also Columbia, which has offered thirteen optional units combined variously into six brackets, namely, "School library service," "College and reference library service," "Public library service," "Cataloguing and classification," "Library work with children," and "Special library service." The Syracuse and Columbia groupings, it may be observed, are analogous on a reduced scale to the parallel programs common in schools of engineering, which imply choice among the numerous divisions of engineering after a given period of fundamental study has been completed; and they suggest likewise the segregations which schools of education make according to the type of teaching contemplated, and the "vocational group requirements" at the Yale Divinity School.^o

The significant feature of the variations built upon electives is that, while providing flexibility, they entail only moderate departure from the conventional curriculum. The common core is, or should be, substantial, and even where the options are numerous and where clusterings of courses are provided, there is likely to be generous overlapping from bracket to bracket, and as a consequence no excessive divergence among individual programs. Such variations imply much less concentration, therefore, than appears, for example, in the elementary curriculum devoted to the preparation of children's or school librarians. What they seek is varieties of emphasis, not specialization. They represent adaptations which were called for long before they came into vogue,^p but

^m See ref. 249.ⁿ See ref. 381.^o See ref. 460.^p See ref. 194.

certainly no disregard of the common curriculum structure or of its matter. All this is sound practice, since general, unspecialized positions predominate in the library world, and since most students do not wish to follow lines which might restrict their markets. Incidentally, if groupings are used the process of settling upon electives may be kept simple enough to obviate bewilderment on the part of students, and to assure a stability in the curriculum which is important in distributing teaching assignments to a faculty.

As is true of the variations previously treated, the building of a program embodying elective courses involves no new procedures. In some respects, indeed, it is simpler than constructing an unmodified curriculum. There is no need to single out a field of any sort, since the purpose is to provide for all the prominent divisions of library work. A broader range of content can be accommodated than in the general curriculum; wider latitude is possible in the proportioning of items; and it seems obvious and natural to assume a systematic development for basic matter and a functional one for specific applications. The major task is to co-ordinate the parts, since it is essential to prevent repetition as between fundamentals and sequels, unnecessary duplication among parallel courses, undue dissimilarities in corresponding courses, and inadvertent omissions generally. The form and arrangement almost inevitably follow the weighted course system, as a means of overcoming the complexities of scheduling.

In contrast with what have been called variations of the curriculum, its extensions exhibit distinctly new features. Like the variations, they aim to provide for diversified needs, but they go indefinitely further than do the variations both in range and intensiveness. They embody plans of specialized study intended mainly, although not without exception, for

persons whose records include an elementary year in a library school plus substantial experience in library work. While not novel in protracting the period of preparation beyond a single year, they are so in being built of matter largely or even wholly unknown to the basic curriculum. They are analogous in a measure to the after-graduation study of the medical specialties.

The realization that curriculum extensions might be in order for some students can be traced well back toward library-school beginnings. It may have had a part in the prolongation of the Columbia College program to two years, although this seems to have been meant originally to provide for a review or for a supposed overflow of material from the primary year ^a—a purpose which continued after the removal to Albany and was predominant at Armour Institute and later at the University of Illinois. Its earliest fruits probably were the Pratt Institute announcement of second-year courses “to fit students for the more scholarly side of library work,” which were inaugurated in 1896 and repeated upon occasion for some time thereafter; ^r and the pioneer teaching in preparation for library work with children at the same institution, ^s which continued until the Training School for Children’s Librarians came upon the scene at Pittsburgh. In turn followed the proposal at New York State about 1902 to offer study leading to the Master’s degree; ^t the projecting at Pratt Institute in 1912 of a so-called normal course, looking to the preparation of library-school instructors, which seems never to have passed the experimental stage; ^u and the initiation in 1912 at the Library School of the New York Public Library of a “senior” curriculum, ^v which eventually went probably as far toward

^a See refs. 108, 411.

^r See refs. 303, 310, 369.

^s See refs. 301, 303, 312, 315, 369.

^t See ref. 280.

^u See refs. 319, 320, 326.

^v See ref. 268.

specialization, in principle if not in actual development, as was possible in a school not associated with a university. Illinois, in 1914, modified its second-year requirements by allowing students who were qualified for graduate courses in such fields as chemistry and political science, and who planned to engage in special library work, to make limited substitutions of such courses for library-school study. In a measure these several efforts were the precursors, as a paper given by Plummer in 1910 was the keynote,^w of the extensive developments in and since 1926. The latter include the initiating of specialized and diversified programs in preparation for advanced degrees at the Columbia University School of Library Service; ^x the introduction of somewhat similar work as the University of Illinois placed its second-year library-school curriculum under graduate-school auspices,^y and presently likewise at the Universities of California ^z and Michigan;^{aa} and the inauguration of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School.^{ab} The flower of all this effort appears in the Columbia and Chicago programs for the doctorate; in which, although there are differences of plan, the purpose is prominent to levy upon various sections of human knowledge and activity for contributions to library work.

Extensions of the curriculum imply both enlarging and diversifying it, the possibilities being wider probably than those in preparation for any other profession, unless it be social work. The schemes of advanced study already in effect would seem to provide for all the needs, and in particularizing them the start again may be taken from the lists of library activities and instructional topics upon which the basic curriculum is assumed to rest. If these inventories are comprehensive, the extensions must consist of whatever

^w See ref. 302.

^x See refs. 118, 121.

^y See ref. 406.

^z See ref. 393.

^{aa} See refs. 133, 412, 413.

^{ab} See ref. 396.

remains after the basic curriculum has been made as inclusive as conditions permit, plus matter which is relevant to library work, but not exclusively so. This falls short of sharp definition, and indeed has been used to a degree in building some second-year programs which cannot be regarded as real extensions. Moreover, it is so broad as to preclude enumeration of all the conceivable components. It points the way to a second schedule of instructional subjects, however, apparently overlapping and yet separable from that which underlies the basic curriculum. The following is offered as an illustration. It should be read in relation to the primary list on pages 62-66, and its categories should be looked upon as representing merely a rough and convenient classification, conforming as closely as practicable to the divisions of library activity on pages 60-61.

STUDY APPROPRIATE TO EXTENSIONS OF THE CURRICULUM

1. Matter which pertains to fashioning a library collection:
 - (a) Further attention to the tools of selection, such as bibliographical repertories and other printed aids, and to existing collections of books throughout the world; also to the literature of defined fields, such as children's books and foreign fiction, and to that concerned with such subjects as religion, international law, archeology, music, ancient history.
 - (b) Study of particular areas of knowledge, as prerequisite to the evaluating of books and other records touching them; such as anthropology, penology, astronomy, art, Anglo-Saxon poetry.
 - (c) Consideration of the techniques applicable in investigating objectively the reading practices of a clientele; in gauging authoritatively the value and effectiveness of specific books and types of books; in estimating accurately the total costs involved in building a collection on a given subject and in given circumstances; and in devising and adapting such methods as will bring the

processes of acquisition to their highest economy and minimum cost.

2. Matter which has to do with organizing and caring for a library collection:

- (a) Further attention to existing systems of classification and to the principles involved in constructing them; to the tools useful in cataloguing; and to applications of cataloguing methods.
- (b) Study of the organization of knowledge; and, as ancillary to this, of whatever sciences may provide background for it, and of their history.
- (c) Consideration of the techniques for perfecting the procedures of organizing and caring for a collection; for example, those for ascertaining what types of catalogues to employ in particular situations, and how full to make them; those for determining how far to use subject headings and how far to utilize or to develop substitutes; those for discovering how to supply the conditions most favorable to the preservation of papers and bindings; those for the adoption of new means of storage; those for simplifying such records as pertain to inventories, accessions, and lending; and those for contriving improved mechanical and labor-saving devices.

3. Matter which relates to using a library collection:

- (a) Further familiarizing with the tools and sources employed in reference service, including both more thorough attention to those of an elementary nature, and the introduction of others more recondite.
- (b) Study, again, of specific divisions of knowledge, which is as essential to the full use of a collection as to its fashioning; and of their history.
- (c) Development of a variety of skills, including those involved in handling tools and sources, such as the systematizing of procedures in searching and the applications of bibliographical principles and methods; those serviceable in revealing means for distributing books and information to groups and to population areas; those important in dealing with inquirers and readers, such as interviewing, diagnosis, and guidance; and those instruc-

tional abilities which are as indispensable in imparting knowledge of the use of books and libraries as in other forms of teaching.

4. Matter which concerns directing the library enterprise:

- (a) Further attention to the more obvious facts, precedents, practices, and other considerations which bear upon administration, including the history and place of libraries, and the aspects of management peculiar to libraries and library departments of particular types.
- (b) Study of numerous subjects of general or wide application which influence the conduct of libraries; such as, in the case of public libraries, municipal finance, state and city administrative organization, and the law of property and contracts; and in the case of college and university libraries, institutional accounting, current developments in higher education, and even extrinsic branches if pursued in such a way as to enhance effectiveness in dealing with faculties and students, or to bring about scholarly productivity; and, in the case of libraries of all kinds, the classification of personnel, the lighting of buildings, and statistical methods.
- (c) Consideration of the techniques of investigation suitable, for example, in deciding upon the number and location of service points; in deriving criteria to govern the capacity requirements of new buildings; in developing rating systems for library staffs; in analyzing the costs of routine operations; and in setting up reliable financial norms for guidance in drafting budgets.

5. Matter which touches library work generally, but no one aspect of it exclusively:

- (a) Further consideration of the history and varieties of written records and of books, of the arts and processes entailed in their production, and, in the case of early texts, of their deciphering.
- (b) Study of the problems incident to the conduct of library commissions and organizations of librarians, to teaching in library schools and the management of such schools, and to the editing of journals devoted to librarianship.

- (c) Study of the history of civilization, of the development of institutions, and of the expansion of knowledge, for their bearing upon the origins and growth of records; study of such branches as psychology and education because of their relevance to the work of library organizations and library schools.
- (d) Consideration of procedures in historical research, particularly as they relate to the interpretation of texts and monuments; of methods of investigation which might influence the future materials of books or lead to new ways of reproducing, condensing, and preserving records; of techniques useful to the staffs of library organizations in making state-wide or nation-wide surveys; and of devices serviceable to library schools in selecting students, determining curriculum content, and perfecting methods of presentation.

The above is to be taken only as a guide, not as a pattern; and as an assemblage of specimen topics rather than a complete register. As already suggested, it comprises, first of all, matter traditionally intrinsic to the basic curriculum, subject to two tests. By one criterion the elements obviously or by agreement must be likely to receive little more than mention in a beginning program, of which paleography and the official publications of European governments are fair examples. An understanding as to these components would have relieved the early library schools of some perplexities in allocating topics, and would be equally useful today, especially since students are fed from various schools into those which provide extensions.^{ac} Pursuant to the other test, the elements in question should be susceptible of altered treatment, such as a shift in emphasis, development by a new set of applications, or some widened or more intensive approach, and should be capable of a presentation appropriate to this. Accordingly a course in bibliography might stress procedures rather than specific tools; one in cataloguing might devote

^{ac} See ref. 37.

itself largely to such material as incunabula, rare books, foreign periodicals, maps, and music; one in library buildings might go into the study of public buildings generally, or with some fullness into that of ventilation; and one in administration might be set up in such a way as to depend upon the case method, or upon field problems, or upon service studies.

The other matter characterizing the extensions consists largely of those liberal studies and peripheral subjects of graduate character which may pertain to some form of library work. They might be particularized by citing on the one hand the knowledge of physics desirable in conducting an engineering library, the familiarity with education essential to a school librarian or to a library-school instructor, and the numerous branches among which a university librarian might choose to establish a scholarly reputation;^{ad} and, on the other hand, by listing certain techniques of wide usefulness which are approaching the status of sciences, notably various methods of gathering and organizing facts. In connection with them there is assumed some actual discipline in using the tools and procedures of investigation, partly with a view to practical applications and partly by way of enriching and completing the instruction itself.^{ae} The excursions in these several directions may well vary in extent with circumstances and with the length of the study period contemplated, as most certainly they must shift with the capacities and interests of individuals; so that for students who are pursuing a single year of advanced work they may amount only to introductions, whereas with candidates for the doctorate they may take a major place and lead not only to mastery of a field or of a methodology, but to a contribution to knowledge.^{af}

The extensions of the curriculum exhibit their separate

^{ad} See ref. 357.

^{ae} See ref. 221.

^{af} See ref. 368.

character most unmistakably when the factors concerned in setting them up are considered. They are unlimited in inclusiveness and length. All conceivable forms of service are contemplated; and it is assumed that students will be able to give a functional interpretation to the teaching, however it is organized, and to use their acquirements in unanticipated ways. The programs lack solidarity, implying the same study, ordinarily, for no two persons. Co-ordination is distinctly the individual's problem, and balance may be the last thing to be desired. Only in a qualified sense can what derives from them be regarded as a curriculum at all, since each scheme of study remains hypothetical until a candidate for it appears, and since in view of their range the possible components by no stretch could be assembled in a compact discipline.^{ag}

In all their aspects extensions of the curriculum involve library schools in broadened activities, the markedly new element in which is the concern with investigation. When programs are composed primarily of matter peculiar to library work, this may mean actual direction of research projects; otherwise, participation with other faculties. Insofar as fresh machinery and independent planning are required, models are abundant, ranging from the community and social studies featured in schools of social work^{ah} and the inquiries exemplified in schools of engineering^{ai} to the development of dissertations common in graduate schools. The work may be managed on a group basis through formal class and course arrangements,^{aj} as often represented in seminars, or by having students share in faculty projects, as practiced with selected members of classes at the Yale Law School;^{ak} or as largely independent enterprises which members of the teaching or research staff merely guide.

^{ag} See refs. 51, 176, 357, 424, 426.

^{ah} See ref. 294.

^{ai} See ref. 257.

^{aj} See ref. 272.

^{ak} See ref. 462.

Doubts may be legitimate as to whether extensions of the curriculum justify themselves, especially since so far they have been utilized only to a modest degree. For the great majority of those engaged in it, library work after all represents a restricted field of activity, in which the opportunities are few and the turnover slow. Most candidates sense this condition rather accurately and, wishing to make their services as widely usable as possible, are content both to anticipate locating in any one of the more general divisions and to assume that a single year of library-school study will fit them for their probable work. Even those who cherish an interest in narrow or specific forms of effort sometimes are deterred from further systematic preparation. Some distrust that it is the thing most relevant to their needs, first because the duties likely to fall to them even within a circumscribed area are difficult to predict and plan for, and second because in-service training seems to them to promise more tangible returns. Some, conscious that there is an element of the precarious in their choice of field, are unconvinced that their prospects warrant a further prefatory investment of time and resources. Still others are not in a position financially to undertake additional study, whatever their views. Those responsible for the maintenance and policies of library schools naturally have been guided largely by the same considerations which have influenced candidates and students. They have observed that library work is slow to organize itself in such strata or sections as would warrant for most persons anything but broad and brief forms of preparation, and have cited as evidence the calls which come to their placement offices. Having been able to see slight place for modified offerings in the basic curriculum, they have been even more conservative in providing them without that curriculum. In a few instances seemingly they have disallowed all occasion for such instruction, on the ground that

a student can qualify best for specialization by coming to his elementary library-school study with appropriate "previous education, experience and temperament,"^{a1} or by service in a public library plus actual work in the desired setting after his one-year period at a library school.^{am} Schools viewing the matter in this light, of course, have rested their case partly on the fact, inescapable in professional education and practice of whatever kind, that a man or woman may display the utmost formal attainment and still fail at his task if he lacks suitable personal qualifications. In the large, however, faculties have inclined not to rule out curriculum extensions as such, but to let them stand or fall according as field conditions may or may not demonstrate the occasion for them.

Obviously extensions of the curriculum must take full account of the objections cited above; but, on the other hand, arguments favoring them have gathered force in recent years. Of these the most tangible are calls from libraries for individuals whose preparation along particular lines can be vouched for as systematic and thorough. Such demands have been moderate in number and it might be easy to exaggerate their significance, notably since librarians often speak confidently about the need for special forms of service without having created the necessary positions and put into their budgets the requisite salaries. At the same time they have proved sufficient to justify something in the way of extensions, for library schools are not given to anticipating placement inquiries by any wide margin.

The reason for amplifying the curriculum which claims greatest attention today, however, rests upon the changing library scene described in Chapter II. How substantial it is, or is likely to grow in a measurably near future, may not be ascertainable with precision; evidence regarding this should

^{a1} See ref. 329.

^{am} See ref. 61.

flow from such a study of personnel needs as library work seems to require. At least it indicates that study beyond the basic curriculum has a place, and that the extensions here under discussion accord with what librarianship is becoming.⁸⁷ They appear to be the most hopeful means on the horizon, for example, for establishing conceptions of library service based upon the verified facts of community and institutional conditions; for assuring the knowledge to deal with specialized book collections and with the patrons dependent upon them;⁸⁸ for moving libraries and librarians toward a unified and effective program; and, finally, for breaking down the barriers between librarianship and cognate fields of effort, and between individuals and their fullest advancement. All of these developments, it seems fair to assume, would follow ample learning and the leadership it should connote.⁸⁹ This is not to say that a superior personnel can be made to order, but that without the kinds of study represented in the curriculum extensions it hardly can be evolved, and that the professional work in prospect warrants every effort to build it. Although the capacities in question are not universally applicable or useful, all are essential in any scheme for the complete equipping of librarianship.⁹⁰ Once they are added there need be no further occasion for concern about prepossession with "expedients and routines" and about failure to move in the direction of a "learned" profession;⁹¹ or for humiliation at handing over significant tasks to experts in subject fields or to alien technicians.⁹²

Incidentally the development of curriculum extensions strengthens the schools. It promotes accommodation to field conditions, and notably to the differentiating of library service and library staffs according to level as this progresses. It enables them to define their aims more clearly and to plan

⁸⁷ See refs. 125, 397.

⁸⁸ See refs. 220, 236, 237, 290.

⁸⁹ See refs. 124, 450, 459.

⁹⁰ See refs. 51, 70, 90, 219.

⁹¹ See ref. 183.

⁹² See ref. 89.

and point their teaching more accurately, since a single discipline no longer is assumed to suit all needs. Finally it helps them to avoid the criticism, sometimes merited by professional schools, that they commingle instruction relevant to two or more planes of work. Fortunately the cohesion of the basic curriculum and the supposed indispensability of the parts composing it make relatively easy the separation of this and the extensions. There has asserted itself no such dilemma as confronts schools of law, for example, in which distinct plans of work on the elementary level may be urged, respectively, for men who are to be managers of estates and for those who are destined for the bench; or as is felt by schools of social work, where no single program can be made to suit equally well as the complete formal training of the playground assistant and as the initial stage of education for the prospective agency administrator. While perfect alignment of the curriculum with field conditions presumably is not to be expected in any profession, probably in librarianship it may be approached more closely than has been realized.

If the strongest argument for the extensions of the curriculum is that some response to the changing character of library work is important, it is fortunate that the disciplines concerned are fluid, and that they may be pervaded with an atmosphere of questioning and surrounded with pressure for discovery and creative effort. The library schools which offer extensions have gone far enough to test their programs at this point. They have elicited in registrants the perplexity and occasional discouragement which, in the presence of unaccustomed problems, are symptoms of growth. Venturing to carry their students into the further reaches of library work, they have not failed to stir them, and are convinced thereby that neither the field is barren nor their own efforts superfluous. This much of demonstration, therefore, is added to the theoretical grounds for extensions of the curriculum.

Discussion of variations and extensions raises the question whether any of the ends they seek may be attained by abridgments of the curriculum. As suggested by the experience with summer sessions and as set forth in Chapter V, this possibility has seemed dubious to faculties, to the committees and other bodies concerned with library-school problems, and to librarians generally. Abbreviations have been abundant, it is true; but where they have not been experimental, they usually have represented a stage in building toward the basic curriculum, or have implied response to a transitional or localized need.⁴¹ This is true even of the shortened programs designed for prospective high-school teachers and elementary-school teachers who plan to give some of their time to the conduct of school libraries, since the status of this group as librarians probably is not permanent.⁴² No such devices ever have satisfied the profession as a whole. Employers generally expect in candidates the measure of preparation represented by the basic curriculum; and, on the other hand, persons lacking it are likely to find themselves debarred from advancement or possibly attempting duties for which they are insufficiently equipped. It seems justifiable, therefore, to take slight account of the numerous offerings which omit topics, or treat important subjects briefly, or are dilute with staff assignments, and which cannot vindicate their scantness as an adjustment to library service at large. This is merely to accept, in principle if not with precision, the standards drawn by the Association of American Library Schools and the Board of Education for Librarianship.

In a growing enterprise no norms are unreviewable, however. Some candidates for library work may need less than the usual amount of instruction in such subjects as classification systems and trade bibliographies, instead of more.

⁴¹ See ref. 160.

⁴² See ref. 175.

Also, if it is desirable for a few students to make liberal and peripheral studies major elements in their preparation, instances may arise in which this should be accomplished by adding abbreviated library-school programs to other graduate work, rather than by extending the library-school curriculum into other fields. That is, if occasional friendly incursions in one direction are advantageous, it hardly is logical to refuse to consider them in the other. Shortening of the curriculum suggests itself, as an example, for a candidate experienced in executive activity in another calling, who requires enough knowledge of reference methods to plan a library budget intelligently but presumably does not need skill in handling a large range of reference tools. The same is true for a prospective readers' adviser who, being well equipped for some aspects of his work through study of literature and psychology, might benefit greatly by attention to subject bibliography but little by spending time upon general administrative procedures. Finally, there are such occasional cases as that of the doctor of philosophy in the field of Romance languages, who plans to direct a library department as a subject specialist, and from whose standpoint the full basic curriculum would contain many indispensables, it is true, but some matter already familiar and some unnecessary.

Cases of the kind cited arise and merit consideration, but ordinarily they can be met by individual adaptations. They are not numerous, and do not group themselves in ways that would justify altered policies and schemes of instruction. Schools whose maintenance depends upon attracting homogeneous elementary classes cannot afford to set up the variety of formal programs they might require. Their accommodation indicates greater flexibility in the curriculum, rather than contraction of it.

Disinclination to abridge the curriculum need not pre-

clude those adjustments due to experienced librarians who enroll at library schools with a view to rounding out their equipment. Such persons commonly are familiar with some of the subjects in the curriculum, and cannot gain by spending time upon them. Comparable instances are those of candidates who feel able to cover parts of the curriculum by nonresident study, perhaps with the help of syllabi. In all such cases the opportunity to prove competence through examinations, to be followed in the event of success by appropriate exemptions from courses, is the obvious solution. This not only permits the saving of time and the avoidance of irritation, but allows some substitution of those liberal and peripheral studies for which the curriculum normally leaves slight latitude, and in which employers and the public increasingly expect graduates of library schools to be versed. While not involving abridgments, such adjustments exemplify a pliancy which is highly desirable in the basic curriculum, whatever its other features. In effect they make possible a response on the elementary level to the changing demands of library work.

There are certain proposals for modifying the curriculum which classify with none of the forms treated in this chapter, yet may have something in common with all. Their sponsors stress the demand for men and women equipped to assume major responsibilities, and as a means of meeting it advocate a completely changed approach. They would not depend upon such devices as already have been discussed, nor stop with presenting the conditions and assumptions of library work as fully as possible and at numerous points within the conventional curriculum, as some schools are endeavoring to do. Rather, they would carry to new lengths the tendency to subordinate processes and to emphasize the settings and significance of librarianship; and, experimentally and for

some candidates at least, they would make attention to backgrounds the initial and perhaps the major factor in the preparation. They would do this by a program of two years, the first to be devoted to those aspects of education, sociology, government, and community life which affect and may be affected by libraries, and the second to deal as far as necessary with the facts, tools, and procedures pertaining primarily to library work.

As has been set forth elsewhere in this volume, the occasion for giving prospective leaders ample foundations is real. The suggestions outlined above represent in part this aim, and possibly in the way most desirable for some aspects of library service. Exploration of them would be in keeping with conditions. They raise issues, however, which are bound up with library work and with recruiting for library service, and also with American practices in higher education.

To begin with, in concerning themselves solely with preparation for positions of a single category, and in calling for a program built from the outset with such posts in view, the proposals go further than previous plans have gone toward multiple avenues of study. They look upon those existing variations of the curriculum which emphasize children's work as a warrant for actual specialization from the beginning, and apparently hold that the principle applies to grades of work as well as to types of work. Their soundness depends partly upon how near libraries are to overcoming the difficulties which have impeded effective distinction among kinds and levels of duties. If, responsive to demands on the part of their constituencies for competent service, libraries find ways and means to divide labor more systematically than they have done so far, library schools undoubtedly will be able to furnish instruction more nicely suited to specific divisions of activity.

Those questions about the new curriculum proposals which

concern recruiting also arise mainly because the special preparation in view is for a single grade of work, and that the highest. Only trial can reveal whether candidates fitted to assimilate the instruction and to step shortly into positions of leadership are to be found; whether acceptable applicants could be selected without undue error and offered incentives for giving two years to professional study; whether students who had spent eight or ten months upon the meaning for libraries of sociology, education, and government, could subsequently be presented with procedures and techniques in a way that would not irk them and that still would meet the needs of practice; and whether the arrangement would operate as satisfactorily as the conventional one in sifting aspirants for library work.

Finally, these suggestions should be viewed in the light of relevant conditions and experience outside library work. Economy and concord require that educational institutions respect each other's fields, and for library schools so far this has meant restriction to subjects almost wholly intrinsic to the calling they represent. Except for branches indispensably basic to the procedures they teach, and excluding the academic courses sometimes embraced in combined liberal and technical programs, a similar rule has obtained for the most part in comparable professions. The burden of proof lies with any school which considers importing matter from other disciplines, as is being recognized regarding preparation for government service. Beside being costly, there is doubt whether the multiplied presentation of background subjects, even when made specific to particular vocations, can add much to those interpretations which it is salutary for students themselves to supply. In any case it might not be feasible for schools of one calling to embark independently upon a plan difficult to articulate with other units and agencies in the educational and professional scheme.

As for possible analogies in preparation for higher grades of work, other professions have succeeded but moderately in hand-picking candidates who are earmarked for leadership, and in giving them training explicitly adapted to their needs. Posts of responsibility ordinarily are attained by adding experience, and sometimes advanced study, to a common initial preparation. Moreover, for one practitioner who requires extensive theoretical study of the backgrounds of his calling, there are many who, assuming a sound liberal education, must assure themselves first of familiarity with tools, facts, and procedures.

As already stated, the variations and extensions of the curriculum now available, together with occasional abridgments and substitutions, have seemed to come as near to precision in meeting the present particularized demands of library work as could be expected. At the same time, the reasons that have been adduced for the variations and extensions may be in some measure reasons for the experiment under consideration; as perhaps also are the problems the scheme raises. There is a chance, too, that a changed approach would prevent leakage to other occupations of competent individuals who may avoid library work because the instruction preliminary to it still appears to exalt methods. Trial of a new curriculum, therefore, which would put study of the place of libraries and of the implications of library work first both in sequence and in importance, may be a logical next step. It would be a bolder departure in education for librarianship than has been undertaken since the opening of the original library school in 1887. To be successful the plan would not need to prove its right to supersede the traditional curriculum, but only its place as an attendant form of preparation.

In recapitulation, as far as can be foreseen the modifications of the curriculum considered in this chapter contain the

answer to the problem put to library schools by the enlarging horizons of library work. Certainly they hold the keys to complete and enriched service, through whatever means it is sought. Together they represent a potential growth and change which deserved the closest attention of faculties.

VIII

SUPPLEMENTS TO THE CURRICULUM

WHATEVER may be true for educational institutions of other kinds, in any professional school the curriculum necessarily falls short of carrying students completely to their goal. Full readiness for the callings they have in view presupposes more than the pursuit of courses. Some of the additional elements can be accumulated only through prior learning and maturing, or after entering actual work; so that, as it has been put in connection with the law, "any school that attempts to turn out finished practitioners mistakes its mission."^a Other elements are obtainable within a school or under its auspices, providing a faculty accepts this possibility, and granting that time and resources permit. What may be done in preparation for librarianship without the limits of the library-school curriculum, it is the purpose of the present chapter to suggest.

Before going further there should be made explicit that description of a curriculum which so far in this book has been assumed. Professional schools exist, it would seem, to assure intending practitioners time-saving preparation, enriched by whatever concern for thoroughness, comprehensive understanding, and comparative treatment their facilities allow and the prospective rewards warrant. Their chief instrument is the curriculum, and it follows that they are bound to organize this in orderly fashion, and so as to promote effective assimilation and to conserve students' time. Except where the teaching rests upon the study of professional problems through sources and methods not generally known or avail-

^a See ref. 336.

able, which in the case of library schools can happen only above the elementary level and with a few students, those plans and forms of instruction alone are admissible which lend themselves to rigorously methodical formulation.

The above definition can be shown to classify two orders of teaching, namely, field work and student guidance, as supplementary to the curriculum rather than as flowing from it. In approaching the first of these, some attention is due to the place in professional education generally of the performance element, as represented by sharing in practical processes. Distinctions need to be recognized, moreover, among the several kinds of contact with the conditions of work.

As has been implied, if there is one thing upon which all persons concerned with professional education must agree it is that participation in actual work is antecedent to competence and therefore an indispensable factor in the preparation of novitiates. The testimony on this point is general, representing not only various callings,^b but doubtless also the several groups interested in each case, namely, employers, faculties, students, and detached critics. The ends in view are not always analyzed clearly, as has been pointed out in relation to library schools by Williamson,^c and as may be true in some other fields. It needs no argument, however, that work contacts may be employed profitably to illustrate and confirm class instruction; and, what is more significant, that they may furnish outcomes and supply tests not to be achieved in any other way. And the principle of course is established that certain learning processes go forward only under conditions involving action; as expressed in homely parlance "first you do it, then you know how to do it." This holds alike for routines and for tasks which entail complicated mental reactions. Its relevance to library work is suggested by the comment once made by the reviewer of a

^b See refs. 80, 198, 224, 335, 336, 341.

^c See ref. 448.

book on acquisition procedures to the effect that "the detailed routine of order cards, bills, and the like can easily be learnt in practice, but can be learnt in no other way";^d and by the obvious fact that a person taking charge for the first time of a reference desk in a library must make repeated attempts and trials before attaining proficiency in the discovery of readers' needs. Insofar as the inculcating of skills has a place in a professional school it is essentially a function of work contacts. Incidentally, in library schools assignments involving performance help to make possible, through diversity of application, those individual adjustments which are difficult to provide under the curriculum.

Not all work contacts are alike, however, and confusion regarding them is probable unless their types are differentiated. It is true that the required definitions are not simple to set up; for a glance at the practice in professional schools generally reveals wide variety, the choices in a particular case seeming to be influenced by the character of the profession, the stage of development of its schools, the nature of the processes to be taught, the facilities available, the theories governing the instruction, the traditions prevailing, and the views and preferences of teachers. Nevertheless, the examples are classifiable and can be reduced to a few major forms, somewhat as below:

Form 1, variously represented in medical schools by amphitheater surgery, in dental schools by the demonstration of ceramic processes and effects before a class, and in schools of law and business by the use of the case method of teaching; and to be looked upon as *class presentation*.

Form 2, illustrated in agricultural and pharmaceutical schools by exercises in the laboratory, and in some law schools by moot courts organized in course form; involving operations carefully prescribed and performed under direction of an instructor in a course, and to be designated as *laboratory work*.

^d See ref. 339.

Form 3, exemplified in schools of optometry by the independent assignment to test a schematic eye or to grind a lens, and in schools of architecture by the project; consisting essentially of unsupervised course work and describable as *problems*.

Form 4, represented approximately in medical schools by participative clinical activity in hospitals and dispensaries, and in schools of engineering by the testing of a proposed industrial process with reference to the elements of manufacturing practicability; managed most advantageously if built into a course, and, since it entails "the problematic act carried to completion in its natural setting,"^e to be looked upon as made up of *projects*.

Form 5, according to which in schools of architecture students are sent to inspect buildings and monuments, in schools of engineering are taken to visit power and manufacturing plants, and in schools of education are directed to watch classes in session under experienced teachers; preferably to be organized as a course or part of a course, and properly to be referred to as *observation*.

Form 6, typified in the case of engineering schools by the alternate scheduling of work and study, in schools of mines by long-term assignment to service in the mining industry, and in medical schools by internship; and, because of its relative detachment and its purpose of interpreting the entire curriculum rather than any one course, properly to be called *field work*.

To turn to library schools, it is evident that they have made intelligent discussion and treatment of work contacts difficult for themselves by glossing the above distinctions and by loose use of terms. It is easy to see, also, that the devices they traditionally have employed to familiarize students with practice may be grouped and designated according to some such scheme as the foregoing. Of those associated with particular courses *class presentation* includes the demonstrating of processes, such as those of book repairing; and use of the case method, examples of this being the eduction of the principles of administration and book selection through the instancing of actual or hypothecated situations. *Laboratory work*, although lacking the discovery element, has come to

^e See ref. 375.

wide acceptance by teachers of cataloguing as a means for supplementing class presentation. *Problems* have been from early days the staple and indispensable method of instruction in reference work and bibliography. *Projects* have been tried in the organizing of book collections, the preparation of bulletins, and the planning and execution of programs for institutes, such assignments taking the form of problems and sometimes being performed under laboratory conditions; and latterly are exemplified in the research undertakings and service studies by students in the schools which offer extensions of the curriculum. Finally, *observation* always has been the central purpose of library-school inspection trips, whether illustrated in the visit to a classed catalogue by a group studying cataloguing, or in the journey to a system or series of libraries by an entire school. As for work contacts bearing on the curriculum in its entirety, *field work* has been a natural inheritance from the days of training under preceptors, and its unquestioned value has assured its persistence, although with modified emphasis, to the present time.

What such an analysis of work contacts reveals most notably is that some may be, and commonly are, treated as course activities, as is true with Forms 1 to 5 above; and that one, namely, the field work of Form 6, apparently does not lend itself so readily to this.^f The contrast is signal, since it is through courses that a curriculum achieves the order and the controls which justify a professional school's existence, and since whatever is not amenable to course organization can be handled most satisfactorily outside the curriculum. Now the virtues and the salient qualities of field work, according to present definitions, are that it limits itself to no one section of the subject or operations concerned; that it aims to familiarize the student with the full gamut of professional duties, as far as may be; that it seeks to give con-

^f See ref. 122.

versance and facility in the life situation; and that it is most faithful to its purpose when it is shaped largely by the unpredictable and perhaps specialized activities of the day in institution, office, or shop. Necessarily, therefore, to plan it meticulously and to methodize it thoroughly would be prejudicial. When, moreover, it is considered that assignments which are irregular tend to be uneven and dilute, the reasons for separating curriculum teaching and field-work instruction are convincing.

The foregoing view is not academic, for if the reader will refer to examples of field work comparable to those cited above, he will recognize that in large part they represent its organization without rather than within the formal curriculum. That is, although not invariably so, such work commonly is scheduled in alternation with, and in addition to, course activities, as is done under the so-called co-operative plan in some engineering schools;^g or in recesses or vacation periods, as is customary in some schools of forestry;^h or after the completion of the class program, as is frequent in medical schoolsⁱ and not unknown in colleges of education.^j The significant exceptions to this practice probably are those whose setting and circumstances would render any scheme of field work successful. There are cases, for example, in which it is possible to organize supervision highly and to defray its costs; and in which incidentally the surveillance of students extends over a two-year or three-year period. Union Theological Seminary and the New York School for Social Work offer such instances, in which the exact location of field work in the program tends to become a secondary matter. Undoubtedly some allowance also should be made for the fact that field experience sometimes is excluded from a curriculum and indeed from a school's purview on grounds

^g See refs. 289, 400, 418.

^h See refs. 373, 417.

ⁱ See refs. 200, 215, 395.

^j See ref. 130.

apart from the difficulty of associating it with courses. Law schools, whatever may be their convictions regarding such instruction, usually lack facilities for it; business schools are likely to hold that the future practitioner's work cannot be defined sufficiently to make it feasible; while in Great Britain professional schools generally incline to the view that securing it is the individual's concern, and to insist only that it be acquired before a credential is awarded.

In some contrast with the usage of other professional schools, library schools predominantly have scattered their field-work assignments in bits throughout the weeks and days of the school year; or have interrupted class activities to provide for them in blocked form,⁶ often abbreviating thereby the periods available for study in course and perhaps ignoring differences among forms of instruction. These procedures would seem subject to question, even granting that other professional schools are not wholly at one regarding the management of field work and that, even if they were so, library schools could hardly be expected to follow them at all points.

The theoretical objections to including field work in the curriculum are more than verified by library-school experience.⁷ If the members of a class are to learn from a life situation, and can do so only by accepting that situation as it is, there are practical reasons that field work for library-school students cannot be planned and executed with precision, even if exactness were intrinsically desirable. The basic cause is that libraries are maintained and administered primarily, if not solely, for the service of their clientele. With them teaching is a foreign function, whose legitimacy in guarded measure may be admitted where the acceptance of novices seems likely to advance the work or to facilitate recruiting, or even by way of professional contribution; but for which the daily routine of most staffs leaves little time or

⁶ See ref. 65.

⁷ See ref. 448.

energy. By the same token, those staff members upon whom responsibility for instruction ordinarily would fall supposedly hold appointment by reason of fitness for library work, not because of ability to teach. These considerations are ample to explain, but not to explain away, the complaint widely voiced by library-school students in past years, namely, that field work often has seemed faultily planned and carelessly directed, and that sometimes it has resulted in casual treatment and waste of time, and even exploitation and neglect. In the light of conditions there is, of course, every reason that assignments to field work should have looked so, as compared with the conduct of courses in a properly organized curriculum and in view of the desire to utilize advantageously every minute of a school year. The experience on which such criticism is based has not been universal, but it has been common.

In spite of past weaknesses, the inference is not to be drawn that instruction approaching in effectiveness that of the classroom is impossible in a library and at the hands of librarians. It is as feasible, given the appropriate conditions, as is the comparable teaching administered successfully in hospitals under the direction of medical schools; and it finds example in certain forms of laboratory work, projects, and even of field work long practiced in a restricted way by library schools. The essentials would seem to be unified direction of library school and library, on the same grounds that obtain for medical schools and hospitals;^m selection of library staff members with a view to instructional capacity, and their ranking and recognition as auxiliaries to the faculty; and the existence of a small, flexible, library organization, in which it is allowable to divert staff time from library duties to library-school responsibilities, to plan the library activities with reference to the teaching function, and to

^m See ref. 55.

consider the presence and needs of a learning group. To catalogue these conditions is to suggest their rarity, and it is not too strong to say that as affecting field work they are to most intents and purposes nonexistent. It is because this has been true that the field-work assignments sponsored by library schools so often have meant little more than time serving.

As an aside, it may be remarked that the theoretical and pedagogical considerations above recited hardly can account for all the failures in the offering of field work. Certain incidental and mechanical breakdowns have contributed, and require to be guarded against even with field work given its appropriate place, assuming of course that it is to be supervised by the schools. For one thing, the burden of the necessary planning, consulting, corresponding, overseeing, and reporting is very considerable, and the demands it imposes over and above the staff and time required to operate the curriculum proper sometimes have been too great. Again, much of the value of field work hinges upon the comments and criticisms of those under whom assignments are performed. Such statements often have been inadequate; and while they probably could be improved even under arrangements of the kind common in the past, this would seem more assured if field work involved more extended periods, and if students were lifted more nearly to the status of staff members. Finally, it has come about latterly that library-school students are too numerous and libraries too scattered and often too remote for success to be achieved without giving field-work assignments more complete right of way at some one point than has been customary, and than seems practicable in a school year without encroachment upon classroom instruction.

Just where field work is to be placed makes considerable difference in the organization and administration of a library school; but probably is less important than its separation

from the curriculum. Granting that it is to remain in association with the schools, and that a reasonably close hand is to be kept on the extramural preparation of students, the choice would seem to be among summer assignments; blocks which would protract the normal period of registration, perhaps on a co-operative plan;ⁿ and the kind of postschool service or internship proposed, although not necessarily to be directed by library schools, as early as 1902 by Bostwick.^o Preschool field work is a possibility, but its value is debatable because it must precede the presentation of reasons and basic facts, because it is apt to be inadequately controlled and pointed,^p and because it may implant indifferent ideas of practice. It has not been sanctioned generally as a requirement by library schools, even though commonly recommended; and certainly it finds little contemporaneous and approved analogy in professional schools of other kinds. The essential in all of the several suggested arrangements, of course, is to help students to interpret or to build upon their classroom instruction, and to acquire ease in their surroundings and aptness in the attendant operations.

Student guidance lies outside the curriculum for reasons analogous to those which hold for field work, and which are inherent in its purpose. It is necessarily individual; it is insusceptible of close organization; and it seeks ends which the curriculum cannot approach. The activity it represents obviously has a place in most educational effort, beginning with the environmental adjustments essential in primary grades, extending through the personal and occupational advising incident to adolescent and early adult years, and continuing in the counseling of students in vocational and professional schools. Its aims are as broad as those of the institutions concerned, and its scope as comprehensive as are

ⁿ See refs. 297, 371.

^o See ref. 81.

^p See ref. 148.

the interests of students. Certain of its aspects are so commonplace and so universally relevant as to call only for passing mention. It goes without saying, for example, that some regard for the health of individuals and the morale of classes is requisite if the ends of the instruction are to be attained, to say nothing of whatever responsibility in such matters mere association with young people imposes. Likewise, direction as to methods of study and the management of their time is generally due students; in any professional school the ways and conditions of work prove novel to many, and even if they are experienced in undergraduate routines and have learned to live according to the principles set forth in the numerous manuals on study techniques now available,^a they may adapt themselves more readily if given suggestions relevant to their immediate difficulties and procedures. Again, all schools have their "problem students," of whom some represent simply extreme examples of the need for supervision in health and study habits, and some live under disabilities which are more serious, even if momentary; these include persons whose family or financial circumstances entail burdens incompatible with effective work, some who in spite of high ability are unstable; and the borderline registrants who turn out more or less definitely to lack the personal qualifications for the careers they contemplate. All such cases, of course, call for treatment other than that which is possible in the classroom, no matter what the nature of the school. In part, the same is true as regards the obligation to inspire students; or, more concretely, to infuse in them purpose, vision, and the incentive and confidence essential to achievement.^r The procedures involved in all this are now recognized as of first importance, and are coming to constitute one of the major divisions of personnel science.*

^a See refs. 72, 78, 135, 201, 432.

* See refs. 84, 134, 192, 203, 295, 298.

^r See ref. 251.

Some further phases of student guidance, however, are either so peculiar or so pertinent in library schools as to warrant planning for their control. Primarily these seek to assure understandings which are not obvious to beginners, although they may have become truisms to librarians and to library-school instructors, and which sometimes only the reiteration and elaboration possible in personal conference can convey with the desired clarity. For one thing, the aims and direction of library-school study are not always appreciated, even by those who have decided to invest a year or more in it. Such persons may want enlightenment as to the reasons for the structure of the curriculum, as to the necessity for attention to methods and techniques in its courses, and possibly as to the ways and theories of professional education generally. Specifically they may need to be shown that the work of the reference desk cannot go on without factual knowledge and without a correctly-made catalogue; and that the administrator cannot allocate funds to departments wisely without grasp of the details involved in the acquisition of books and in the taking of inventory. What is even more basic, a correct and adequate conception of library work as a whole is not always to be assumed even in men and women who have enjoyed library experience, and when the class presentation of the matter is repeated and thorough. Often it is necessary to convince students that the libraries and library practice they have observed are not representative, to demonstrate that library work is varied and growing, and perhaps even to show that the librarian's task is one not for the sentimentalist, the zealot, or the drone. Some disillusioning may be entailed, and is a legitimate responsibility.

Besides the promotion of general understanding, student guidance in library schools may shed light on concrete problems. Before or after their introduction to the library

field has been completed, students sometimes crave advice as to whether to settle their minds upon public-library work or college-library work, upon administration or subject specialization, upon reference work or cataloguing. For their own welfare and to keep the number of misfits and the percentage of turnover low they require to have explained not only such major fields of opportunity, with the compensations and drawbacks of each, but also, for example, the work of readers' consultants, the possibilities in library extension, and the prospects for research activity. While it is conceivable that with an individual all of several contemplated paths may lead to the same end, and true that actual opportunities easily may sweep aside the most deliberate choice of avenues, nevertheless even an academic question may appear momentous to him, and incidentally contribute in a material degree to his professional education. If his school is one in which options among courses are offered, the issue is sharpened at some stage by the necessity for a decision among these, and by the commitment as to future lines of work which this may seem to carry. In case the time has arrived definitely to accept or decline a position, it may seem to a student that his career is in the balance. How much more prominent guidance may well be in a professional school than in an arts college appears when it is realized that questions of the kind cited are apt to press at any moment in the period of residence.

If student guidance in library schools is as important as the foregoing situations would indicate, and entitled to recognition as an extracurricular form of instruction, some steps to regularize it are essential. These steps may vary with circumstances; and in providing for them library-school authorities may review profitably the experience of other professional schools as well as the conditions and practices of their own group. The simplest devices of course are the

ordinary vehicles of announcement which practically all schools of whatever kind employ, namely, bulletin boards, direction sheets, and assembly talks. All of these are possible in numerous varieties, direction sheets notably ranging from mimeographed memoranda to printed manuals, and assembly presentations from occasional statements to organized orientation series. Reliance upon informal, spontaneous conferences between individual students and faculty members or other officers is perhaps equally general, and possibly such conferences are to be regarded as the most potent means for influencing students outside the classroom; while they may and will transpire without planning and may owe to this fact much of their merit, enough schools and instructors thoughtfully encourage them, or apparently would do so if necessary, to suggest that merely allowing them to happen is insufficient. In institutions as small as most library schools are, it is true, the invitation to consult is inherent naturally in the setting; but as enrollment increases effort may well be exerted to make it explicit, without rendering it profuse and without schedulizing.

The central problem of student guidance in professional schools seems to be to decide how much is gained by establishing formal machinery for it, and whether more is called for than assurance that members of a faculty are easily accessible and receptive to student approach. Some schools have achieved what they consider to be good results by systems of assigned advisers; the New York School of Social Work and the Yale Divinity School are among these, while the Department of Social Science and Administration at the London School of Economics is said to stipulate that students seek their consultants only at stated times and after having submitted agenda covering what they wish to discuss. Among library schools the Columbia University School of Library Service has experimented with a distribution of

students to specified advisers. On the whole, however, the greater weight of opinion and experience apparently is that with adults such plans can be only partially effective. Theoretically the objections are that persons in a professional school know when they need counsel and where to go for it, that the essence of the relation lies in student initiative, and that if formalized an advisory arrangement will defeat itself. In practice it seems clear that such students do not wish surveillance, and that when they desire to confer regarding their affairs they prefer to choose their consultants; the interview made in pursuance of an assignment accordingly is apt to be marked by constraint and embarrassment. The one important qualification of this principle is that systematized arrangements for interviews seem promising when they can be tied up with accustomed routines involving intercourse between students and members of a school staff, such as registration procedures, the approving of programs, and the oversight of field work and of other noncourse activities. At the London School of Economics, for example, the contacts between students and advisers are made close and natural by the fact that the latter begin to function in passing upon applications, taking the place for the most part of a committee on admissions; at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education and under the University of Glasgow Faculty of Law, the counseling simply continues the conversations incident to the mapping of individuals' work; at the Institute of Education of the University of London tutors carry many of the duties entailed in the direction of student teaching, and in the course of this serve as advisers; while at the Harvard University Theological School the function is said to be so merged with responsibility for the students' showing in the final comprehensive examinations as to be a scarcely distinguishable part of this. Library schools therefore which are dissatisfied with formal

schemes of counseling, and yet which are too large or for other reasons not content to leave the matter to chance, may find it worth while to yoke the advisory process with other activities. This may be the safest means of assuring not only its natural place and working but its proper balance, since, important as it is, there is always the possibility of overreaching in the effort to do it justice. Just how its various aspects most satisfactorily may be distributed among directors or deans, teachers, and special personnel officers is a problem of administration which, however decided, does not affect the nature and place of student guidance.

Whatever specific ends may be contemplated in student guidance, and in whatever way it may be managed, it lodges with the professional school primarily as a means of amplifying and effectuating the curriculum. This gives it its warrant and should supply its direction. To the classes enrolled it may afford a finished comprehension of future duties, in providing which the composite of course instruction, however well organized, often falls short. To a school incidentally it may be a governor, enabling a faculty to preserve correct adjustments in such matters as student load, and to detect and correct gaps and anomalies in the curriculum. Its consideration therefore is germane and indeed essential in any study of the curriculum.

IX

WHERE THE CURRICULUM BELONGS

SOMEWHERE in the launching or management of a professional school there must be determined the age level and the academic plane at which its curriculum is to be located, and the institutional affiliation, if any, which it is to assume. These decisions cannot be made in the abstract, for they hinge upon the purposes and nature of the curriculum, upon conditions in the profession concerned, and upon practices in the educational world and at particular colleges and universities. They should not be taken until the other major problems in a school's program have been resolved, and then not without review of the factors, both internal and external, which bear upon its plan. Such a survey is desirable particularly in the case of library schools, since they are relatively new on the professional scene and have little precedent of their own to lean upon, and since as a class they have not turned to full account the available examples and analogies.

For library schools the determination of level stands first in importance, bound up as it is with the several views as to the nature of librarianship. Whether library work as a whole necessarily presupposes any universal minimum of general education, how far the difference between the library work of earlier decades and that of today calls for recognition in the schools, how many grades of library duties are sufficiently distinguishable to warrant separate programs of preparation—all these and some ancillary questions must be answered, in picking out the most acceptable plane. It is not strange, with conditions varying as they have done, that so far no

single solution has prevailed, even though in their relatively short history library schools seem to have tried all the possible adjustments.

When the earliest library schools were founded it was natural that their level should be somewhat undefined. Education for library work necessarily was a venture. As with the length of the curriculum, one consideration was to meet the capacities and even the convenience of candidates. At Columbia College the specifications for admission were "sufficient natural fitness, ability and education to take the course creditably, and thereafter engage successfully in library work"; while a college education was held desirable, "exaction" of a degree was disapproved.^a Pratt Institute, although utilizing examinations at the inception of its library school as well as of its training class, sought to provide for such persons^b as even the indeterminate Columbia-New York State conditions might exclude. Drexel stipulated "a good English education, equivalent to the diploma of a high school or college of good standing,"^c and Armour a high school education or something comparable to this;^d and both of these schools employed entrance examinations. Some groping for a level, and the wish for an advanced one, are evident in all this, but also general uncertainty as to what library work warranted, and what conditions aspirants for it would and could meet.

As soon as the initial experimentation was passed, cleavages of opinion began to appear, and over the subsequent period and until the present the practices followed fall into three classes. Some schools, notably Pratt Institute, have made a permanent principle of the flexibility with which the schools generally began; they have held consistently that the adoption of a fixed level is a secondary matter, and that the nature of library work requires keeping the door open to

^a See ref. 110.

^b See refs. 299, 309.

^c See ref. 161.

^d See ref. 356.

candidates of apparent promise, without too close regard for the formal education presented. Drexel until its suspension in 1914,^e and the schools at the New York,^f St. Louis,^g and Los Angeles^h public libraries until about the time the standards of the Board of Education for Librarianship came into effect, largely adhered to this position; but Pratt Institute now is its only exponent.ⁱ The schools of another group, while beginning with elastic or relatively lenient stipulations, have adopted progressively higher levels. Columbia College and New York State early urged the college education which they did not require, and after intermediate stages New York State finally put into effect a graduate basis in 1902.^j As stated, Armour began by accepting high school graduates, upon examination;^k but in 1898 its successor school at the University of Illinois stipulated two years of college work for admission,^l and in 1911 began the acceptance of college graduates only.^m At the Carnegie Library School also the advance has been from an examination plan to graduate requirements,ⁿ and at Western Reserve University substantially the same.^o The school at the University of Wisconsin,^p and the more recently established ones at the Universities of Washington,^q California,^r and Michigan,^s exhibit comparable although less marked changes. A third set of schools, coming upon the scene for the most part after the Board of Education for Librarianship had formulated its first classification, seems to have aimed to choose permanent levels; its examples presuppose variously two, three, and four years of college work, but they are alike in being definite. In the sub-classes indicated, the New York State College for Teachers may be cited as setting up the two-year requirement for the beginning of its library-school program,^t

^e See ref. 157.

^f See refs. 269, 270.

^g See ref. 348.

^h See refs. 238, 239.

ⁱ See ref. 322.

^j See ref. 280.

^k See ref. 356.

^l See ref. 356.

^m See ref. 410.

ⁿ See refs. 96, 101.

^o See refs. 433, 440.

^p See refs. 453, 458.

^q See refs. 421, 423.

^r See refs. 391, 392.

^s See refs. 413, 415.

^t See ref. 274.

Denver as standing for a straight three-year prerequisite,^u and Louisiana State University as using a graduate basis.^v

Some variants in practice are ignored by the above groupings, but only one calls for mention, and this merely because it tends to confuse the classification according to level. In a few instances, as has been the case in some schools of social work and of business, for example, it has been customary to spread the professional study over two or more college years and to parallel it with arts and science courses. The schools at Simmons College,^w at Syracuse University,^x and at the New York State College for Teachers,^y have exemplified this. There are reason and merit in the arrangement, since it may open the way for a salutary control over undergraduate programs, and since, as has been pointed out in connection with schools of business,^z it may encourage students to an early choice of vocation and help them to relate their college instruction to it; but to adopt it on these grounds is to ignore central factors in the fixing of level. What these factors are will be discussed presently.

The diversity of levels was one of the puzzling circumstances confronting the Board of Education for Librarianship when it began its work in 1925. Accrediting bodies in other fields up to that time had relied largely upon the classifying of schools to give force to their standards, and the plane on which instruction was offered was assumed to be one of the bases of this device. Building on what the Association of American Library Schools had done, and planning by mild measures both to clarify and improve conditions, the Board shaped a classification in the main to fit circumstances as they then existed, or as they might become shortly and without strain. This meant acknowledging no less than four groups of schools, and distinguishing them primarily accord-

^u See ref. 401.

^v See ref. 243.

^w See ref. 366.

^x See refs. 379, 380.

^y See ref. 274.

^z See ref. 217.

ing to the amount of study prerequisite to entrance. After some hesitation as to terminology they were designated as (1) junior undergraduate, (2) senior undergraduate, (3) graduate, and (4) advanced graduate, the academic admission conditions consisting, respectively, of (1) one, (2) three, and (3) four years of college study, and (4) four years of college plus one year in a library school. This appeared soon to be an over-refinement, and possibly even to typify a mistaken emphasis upon entrance regulations. As a standing ground it was defensible, but it needed simplifying. By the time the Board revised its requirements in 1933 one step in this direction had become feasible, and the accredited schools were distributed under three heads, namely, (1) those stipulating anything other than "four years of appropriate college work for admission," (2) those prescribing four years of college study before entrance and offering simply an elementary curriculum one year in length, and (3) those demanding four years of prior college work and providing advanced programs, either in addition to a basic curriculum or in place of it.^{aa} As far as entrance conditions for the basic curriculum are concerned this meant reducing the classes from three to two. The additional category, in the new as in the original scheme, is designed for those schools which prepare for advanced degrees, the possession of arts or science degrees and the completion of a year of professional study ordinarily being assumed, and the significant features having to do mainly with functions, plans of organization, and methods of work.

It seems reasonable to suppose that by now the possible planes for the basic curriculum have been explored amply, and that there is on hand sufficient evidence to guide those concerned with defining them or choosing among them. Assuming prior differentiation among levels in library work

^{aa} See ref. 16.

itself, the first consideration is the extent of preliminary general education desirable in preparation for each. What background is necessary, for example, in carrying on loan-desk work in a public library, in classifying books in a college library, in supplementing the efforts of teachers by means of a school library, or in performing later the other duties to which any of these may lead? Answers to these questions are attainable if they are not already obvious; and as indicating the level appropriate for a school they are likely to be misleading only insofar as the divisions in library work itself are still vague, and insofar as the lines between them commonly are crossed in practice. The second determining factor is the material of the curriculum. Granting that up to the present this has been concerned more with methods and tools than with abstract knowledge, should it be given an undergraduate allocation because study of it supposedly is suited to undergraduate capacities and instructional procedures; or should it be placed in the after-college years on the theory that, as in the case of social work, students cannot concentrate upon both cultural and professional subjects at once,^{ab} and that professional courses should succeed completion of the academic groundwork, whatever their specific nature and however mature the students pursuing them may be? Or, is the curriculum necessarily indivisible, and could a more fitting disposition of its contents be accomplished by putting some on one level and some on another, again having regard for teaching effectiveness, for the abilities and interests marking students at various educational stages, and for the fact that the effect upon them of their introductions to the several library-school studies may depend in part upon the timing of these introductions? ^{ac} It is notable that students may be ready to acquire familiarity with bibliographical form, and to take satisfaction in it, before they can appreciate all

^{ab} See ref. 246.

^{ac} See ref. 333.

that is involved in book selection; and that after they have become ready to assimilate the principles of administration they may be irked by the routines of the order room or charging desk. Upon the placing of matter therefore may hang not only the success of the learning process, but the attractiveness of the curriculum and of library work to possible recruits.

At least two other factors weigh in the selection of level for the library-school curriculum or its parts. Not only may a given measure of general education be essential to the discharge of stated library duties, but its maintenance may be worth while for its prestige value; and where the arguments for two levels are evenly balanced, this might easily incline the decision toward the higher rather than the lower. Again, much always depends, as is pointed out in other connections, upon the amount of individual equipment^{ad} which the profession is able and society is willing to pay for. When the early library schools sought to adjust the length of the curriculum to the time students could devote to it they were proceeding in part on this principle, although presumably the novitiates of that day neither knew nor cared as much as do those of the present about what rewards might be expected; and although it was not possible then to envisage all the preparation that library work entails and the place of the library school in the process. Because they are expected to attune themselves to conditions, no less than because they must keep their classes filled, both in locating and in building the curriculum library schools obviously must hold in view the rewards open to graduates.

What the requirements of library work, the character of library-school courses, and the esteem and compensations of librarianship indicate as to the level of the library-school curriculum seemingly should be conclusive. As is true in all

^{ad} See refs. 129, 259, 344.

institutionalized aspects of education, however, accidental conditions play a qualifying part. Probably all library schools have felt them, not excepting those which have been connected with public libraries, and which accordingly have been influenced least by judgments and regulations other than their own. When schools are parts of universities or colleges, the authorities who control appropriations and policies may be guided by examples which they observe elsewhere; or by preconceptions as to preparation for library work, and as to the most convenient way of fitting it into their own organizations. Where schools have been associated with public libraries there sometimes has been pressure to consult too far the needs of the individual libraries concerned, even though the instruction was intended to be general in application, and actually was largely so. Library-school faculties themselves may be influenced unduly by incidental advantages in favoring particular levels. For example, graduate status may seem necessary if there is to be the institutional autonomy which the fullest service to the profession demands, or if students are to be recruited from a wide range of colleges, or if desired recognition is to be assured. Relations with other curricula may be determining, as has happened with library-school programs located in teachers' colleges, amid conditions rendering it of moment that intending librarians devote no more years to their study than do prospective teachers. Underlying theories as to the articulation of general and professional education may enter, such as the view that the two may well be kept distinct, or, on the contrary, that the superior practitioner can be produced only through their fusion. Finally, the notion that librarians should be invested with certain degrees may bring it about that, instead of being placed where it is fundamentally appropriate and followed with suitable credentials, the curriculum is assigned its position with the aim of leading to given insignia. The last possi-

bility is the more to be avoided since the awarding of degrees generally in the United States is not fully regularized.

The choice of level is a task in which each school must judge what factors are basic, and what secondary. In the absence of any universally fitting solution decisions are bound to vary, and probably should do so. For the present it seems that the first graduate year is the preferable plane, everything considered, for the majority of students and for most schools. It assures a minimum of general education which is none too high for the predominant requirements of practice, and yet which certainly is as much as the rewards in most cases warrant; it fits without friction into university machinery; and it admits of credentials which, in the light of prevalent anomalies, at least are not unjust. Its weakness, namely, that it ignores the suitability of some of the curriculum material to undergraduate interests, abilities, and learning habits, is minor in comparison with the advantage of presenting all the strictly professional subjects as a unit and on the highest academic level required by any of them. Undoubtedly students are likely to see the contour of their work and the relations of its parts more readily, and assimilation therefore is apt to be more successful, if the instruction not only is concentrated but is preceded by a sound general education. Exceptions to the graduate arrangement are allowable and perhaps still desirable for sections of the field which can absorb the resulting product,^{ae} but the occasions for them seem to be diminishing.

The foregoing conclusions are supported in a measure by events. The simplified classification adopted by the Board of Education for Librarianship in 1933 was possible largely because of the movement among the schools toward higher academic status; for by the time of its promulgation nine of the twenty-seven schools accredited were requiring degrees

^{ae} See ref. 202.

for entrance and eleven of the remaining eighteen had reached the point of stipulating three years of college work.⁴⁷ In general the practice as here indicated is clear-cut. Cases arise, however, in which schools on a graduate basis see fit to admit limited numbers of persons who have reached only senior standing in affiliated arts colleges;⁴⁸ and in which institutions offering advanced study, while requiring a bachelor's degree for entrance to the elementary curriculum, are willing to accept as candidates for higher degrees graduates of schools in which the beginning curriculum occupies one of the four years spent in preparation for the baccalaureate. Deviations of this kind probably are justified, and might remain so even if the basic curriculum came uniformly to a graduate position; just as there may be warrant for admitting occasionally to advanced courses persons who have not completed an elementary year of professional study, particularly when they are not candidates for degrees. If the distinctions between graduate and undergraduate schools are worth keeping, however, such exceptions should be made only for good cause.

The affiliations of the curriculum, as contrasted with its level, have been of secondary concern to librarians and library schools, perhaps because various assumptions affecting them have been accepted uncritically. In any case, an examination is in order of the factors which would weigh if a contemplated school had opportunity to choose among several auspices, or if an existing school was free to review its affiliations and set out to ascertain whether it could do better for the profession and for its students by putting itself in a new situation.

The strong tendency in the United States today, of course, is to associate professional curricula of most sorts with colleges or universities. This idea represents a growth, however,

⁴⁷ See ref. 12.

⁴⁸ See ref. 439.

and the commonness with which library schools have had connections of other kinds may be laid perhaps to its imperfect development at the time the earlier schools were planned; or possibly to doubt as to how far their instruction and the work for which they aimed to fit students were professional. It will be recalled that the original library school, although in the beginning under the aegis of a college, shortly moved to a state library, and that the three schools next to arise were made parts of institutes. Of the others which came into being up to 1926, five, including some of the strongest in the list, were attached to public libraries, and one to a state library commission. Whatever the theories and underlying causes, the immediate explanation of all this is that library authorities were the ones to feel first the need for a supply of workers, and that the simplest means of meeting it was the initiation of classes and schools under their own direction. They undoubtedly would have had to wait long for adequate action and support at the hands of universities. Some of them might have been averse to such assistance if it had come, for the opinion was strong that integration with a library and supervision by the chief officer of a library were indispensable if intimacy with the field was to be maintained, if work contacts were to be sufficient, and if the spirit and atmosphere of library activity were to permeate the classroom. The early sponsors presumably were not greatly disturbed by disadvantages in the position which they preferred for the schools, if indeed they were conscious of drawbacks.

As library work and the functions of library schools came to be viewed more broadly, however, the possible merits of a university connection were appreciated. On the one hand it was seen that a school unable to provide access to preparatory and auxiliary instruction was subject to embarrassment whenever students needed to fill gaps in their prerequisites

or to study given subjects with reference to specific forms of library work; and perhaps it was discerned, as it was in relation to social work, that separation from the facilities essential to these purposes tended to impair the cultural tone and scholarly orientation of a professional school.^{ah} On the other hand it came to be believed that schools isolated from universities were apt to organize the curriculum loosely, to lack well-defined teaching standards, to be handicapped in attracting proficient faculties, to be limited in their power of recruiting, and to want the machinery necessary for the most competent selection of students; and that they were likely to be insecure and impermanent as to their support, to labor under pressure to make their programs and service parochial, and to find difficulty in viewing library work with appropriate detachment and perspective. All this helped to set the stage for the suggestion implicit in the early reports of the Board of Education for Librarianship, that schools not already so situated might well be made parts of universities.^{ai} None now remain under the auspices of public libraries unless there be counted that at St. Louis, which suspended temporarily in 1932.^{aj} Only that at Pratt Institute strictly can be considered as belonging to an institute, which, of course, itself is a teaching agency. All other accredited schools enjoy some form of college or university connection, including two which began at institutes, and five which formerly were conducted by public libraries or by state library agencies.^{ak}

The expectations based upon university affiliation on the whole have been justified, which is significant, since other sponsorship previously had been upheld with vigor and had met with some success; but this should not be allowed to obscure possible detriments. If dangers exist they are not unavoidable; and yet they may call for cautions, lest involvement with large and complex organizations warp the pur-

^{ah} See ref. 388.

^{ai} See refs. 9, 10.

^{aj} See ref. 347.

^{ak} See ref. 13.

poses or hamper the activities of the schools. As has been said regarding professional schools generally, it is imperative that they preserve their freedom to teach what their constituencies require, at the time and in the manner most fitting, and unhampered by academic patterns or regulations.^{a1} This means that their curriculum and course organization should be suited to the material and duties of practitioners, however unconventional the results may appear to the officers of other colleges and departments; that their programs should not be tied in restricting ways to the schedules and credit systems of the institutions to which they belong; that there should be represented every type of work contact that can be made to conform to the instructional aims and nature of the curriculum; and that relations with the field should be kept intimate. Regarding all these points it is urgent for a library school which seeks a university connection to satisfy itself, and for one already possessing it to be watchful.

Their own effect upon universities can hardly be a matter of indifference to library schools, since they cannot profit in the long run unless the association is mutually advantageous. If Flexner is correct as to what universities should be,^{am} he is right in holding that most professional schools are an encumbrance to them, and can only dilute their aims and dissipate their energies. No matter how important it may be to have universities of the kind urged by Flexner, however, and no matter how important to call them by that name, the United States seems committed to another conception and to another use of the word "university," according to which the service function is linked with teaching and research.^{an} There is ground consequently for holding with Leonard that through the addition of professional schools universities gain vitality, an enlarged clientele of mature, serious people,

^{a1} See refs. 129, 344.

^{am} See ref. 181.

^{an} See ref. 105.

strengthened and more catholic outside contacts, security from provincialism, stimulus to research, and increased public confidence.^{ao} The disciplines in such schools of course should rest upon "a substantial body of higher learning," as Reed has put it;^{ap} but it has been shown that library schools can claim this, at least as regards considerable sections of their curriculum. They need be out of place in the university setting therefore only if they fail of the standards appropriate to the vocational group they serve or if introduced without due consideration of their cost and of the facilities and position they require.^{aq}

Speculation is inviting about an arrangement for professional schools whereby the advantages both of university and non-university status might be assured, and the possible weaknesses of each avoided. If professional schools of all kinds were to be gathered into a few great central agencies designed for their management alone, it might be possible to supply the standards, the equipment, and the support which all require, and at the same time to make certain for each the complete autonomy and integration with its professional field which university connections may have a tendency to abridge. This incidentally might imply also a measure of release for research institutions, under whatever name. There seems to be on the horizon, however, no dissatisfaction or incentive sufficient to draw into such an alignment agencies now so separated as are the schools of the various professions; and perhaps there is little reason to anticipate that if this came about, conditions would be greatly unlike those existing in the families of professional schools now fostered by universities. There is the contingency, too, that the various professional units might drift into isolation from each other, and might presently find themselves little better off, as far as mutual helpful influence

^{ao} See ref. 230.

^{ap} See ref. 334.

^{aq} See ref. 183.

is concerned, than have been commercial schools of dentistry, or library schools attached to public libraries. All considered, it seems clear that there is a positive balance of benefit in the university affiliations now prevalent, and that essentials in professional schools are not being subordinated for material or superficial gains.

If association with universities were really an issue, one fact would argue for it conclusively where library schools offering advanced work are concerned. As has been pointed out, in such schools programs permitting excursion into other disciplines bid fair to be desired increasingly, and the accommodation of individuals is paramount. Registrants must be assured the unlimited resources and flexible arrangements which are requisite in preparation for the highest reaches of any professional work, and which are too diverse and unpredictable to be secured apart from the repertory and without the intimate inter-faculty relationships which university organization affords. Students must be free to carry on the major part of their study wherever this is most advantageous. It does not follow from these needs that a library school or department offering specialized study, any more than one providing an elementary curriculum only, should relinquish control over programs pointed to library work,^{ar} much less surrender its identity within a university. Doubtless the interdigitation with other departments should be close, since the aims and activities of students in graduate schools and of advanced students in professional schools are much alike;^{as} and it would be surprising if library schools, easily assimilable as their work is, did not respond to this logic in the future even more fully than they have done so far, notably at the Universities of Illinois^{at} and Michigan.^{au} A teaching staff which preserves its autonomy is likely to occupy the most

^{ar} See ref. 424.

^{as} See refs. 7, 183, 449.

^{at} See refs. 404, 406.

^{au} See ref. 415.

favorable position for sensing and meeting field conditions, however; and the avenues of joint action with graduate faculties are likely to be clear as far as instruction is concerned. If co-ordination in research is less simple, the solution may lie in the proposal advanced for university professional schools generally by Russell; that is, in the creation at universities of investigational divisions representing the several fields of professional activity, standing somewhat apart from the various teaching departments, and providing arenas in which the research resources of the graduate schools may be brought to bear upon the problems of the professional schools.⁴⁰ The example at the Yale University Institute of Human Relations, to say nothing of such less formal but equally significant co-operative enterprises as are sponsored at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, indicates the possibilities in this.

Teachers' colleges and schools of education have come in recent years to figure prominently in the consideration of library-school affiliations, even though ordinarily they are concerned only with those forms of the curriculum which yield candidates for school-library work. These forms are (1) the makeshift but necessary abbreviations which aim at fitting prospective teachers for part-time library duties, and which raise no questions of institutional connection because they would hardly be offered elsewhere than at teachers' colleges; and (2) certain of the fixed variations of the basic curriculum treated in Chapter VII of this volume, which may have a place in teachers' colleges provided the standards are kept high and the product clearly is in demand.

A teachers' college, like a university, furnishes opportunities and an environment which may contribute signally to the equipment of prospective librarians, these consisting of courses in education and of day-to-day contact with the

⁴⁰ See ref. 346.

patterns of thought prevailing in school circles and among teachers. Beyond that, the location of a library school curriculum in a teachers' college is apt to be advantageous to whatever extent that college supplies the standards of organization and instruction, the facilities for the recruiting of staff and of students, the catholicity of outlook, and the stability of support, which are assumed to be obtainable at a university; and insofar as the institution as a whole is concerned for scholarship and research as well as for service. The potential handicaps are that the larger enterprise may overshadow the lesser to a degree greater even than is likely in a university, and may prove restricting to activities not wholly homologous with its own; that the instruction and management may slight those aspects of professional librarianship which lie beyond the purview of persons engaged in teacher-training; and that because of concentration upon school conditions and upon the needs of libraries in schools students may be ill-equipped for the service in libraries of other kinds which may beckon them later. Incidentally, at times when the ranks of teachers generally are crowded, the functioning of library-school programs under such auspices may render the overflow from teaching into general library work more easy than is salutary, either for the library profession or for candidates aiming to enter it.

Because libraries are indispensable to schools, the sponsorship of the library-school curriculum by teachers' colleges is involved with other questions affecting school libraries. Is there matter relating to books and to library use, library functions, and library management which should be accepted as generally essential in teacher-training? If so, ought teachers' colleges to incorporate such instruction regularly and to stop there, leaving the preparation of librarians to library schools situated in universities or elsewhere? These issues need to be viewed in the light of conditions peculiar to the

favorable position for sensing and meeting field conditions, however; and the avenues of joint action with graduate faculties are likely to be clear as far as instruction is concerned. If co-ordination in research is less simple, the solution may lie in the proposal advanced for university professional schools generally by Russell; that is, in the creation at universities of investigational divisions representing the several fields of professional activity, standing somewhat apart from the various teaching departments, and providing arenas in which the research resources of the graduate schools may be brought to bear upon the problems of the professional schools.^{av} The example at the Yale University Institute of Human Relations, to say nothing of such less formal but equally significant co-operative enterprises as are sponsored at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, indicates the possibilities in this.

Teachers' colleges and schools of education have come in recent years to figure prominently in the consideration of library-school affiliations, even though ordinarily they are concerned only with those forms of the curriculum which yield candidates for school-library work. These forms are (1) the makeshift but necessary abbreviations which aim at fitting prospective teachers for part-time library duties, and which raise no questions of institutional connection because they would hardly be offered elsewhere than at teachers' colleges; and (2) certain of the fixed variations of the basic curriculum treated in Chapter VII of this volume, which may have a place in teachers' colleges provided the standards are kept high and the product clearly is in demand.

A teachers' college, like a university, furnishes opportunities and an environment which may contribute signally to the equipment of prospective librarians, these consisting of courses in education and of day-to-day contact with the

^{av} See ref. 346.

patterns of thought prevailing in school circles and among teachers. Beyond that, the location of a library school curriculum in a teachers' college is apt to be advantageous to whatever extent that college supplies the standards of organization and instruction, the facilities for the recruiting of staff and of students, the catholicity of outlook, and the stability of support, which are assumed to be obtainable at a university; and insofar as the institution as a whole is concerned for scholarship and research as well as for service. The potential handicaps are that the larger enterprise may overshadow the lesser to a degree greater even than is likely in a university, and may prove restricting to activities not wholly homologous with its own; that the instruction and management may slight those aspects of professional librarianship which lie beyond the purview of persons engaged in teacher-training; and that because of concentration upon school conditions and upon the needs of libraries in schools students may be ill-equipped for the service in libraries of other kinds which may beckon them later. Incidentally, at times when the ranks of teachers generally are crowded, the functioning of library-school programs under such auspices may render the overflow from teaching into general library work more easy than is salutary, either for the library profession or for candidates aiming to enter it.

Because libraries are indispensable to schools, the sponsorship of the library-school curriculum by teachers' colleges is involved with other questions affecting school libraries. Is there matter relating to books and to library use, library functions, and library management which should be accepted as generally essential in teacher-training? If so, ought teachers' colleges to incorporate such instruction regularly and to stop there, leaving the preparation of librarians to library schools situated in universities or elsewhere? These issues need to be viewed in the light of conditions peculiar to the

field of education, and have been investigated by Fargo under a joint committee of the American Library Association and the American Association of Teachers Colleges. The recommendations flowing from this effort should reduce the uncertainty which the authorities both of teachers' colleges and library schools have shown in their approach to a common problem.

X

THE CURRICULUM IN PERSPECTIVE

IN BUILDING or maintaining a curriculum of any kind the natural tendency is to concentrate upon questions which press for decision, and which spring directly from conditions existing within the school and clientele concerned. For the most part this fact has governed the discussions so far in the present volume. At some point in dealing with a library-school curriculum, however, it is desirable to consider collectively certain principles of general relevance in professional education, and others especially pertinent to library schools; reviewing them much as might be done by a critic to whom they, rather than the immediate problems of a particular school or set of schools, were of interest.

First of all there is to be recognized the distinction in preparation for a calling between training and education. "Training" may be assumed to hold in prospect routinized, repetitive tasks, and to connote the learning of methods and processes which call for little discretion and which conceivably may be exercised with only remote reference to their meaning. "Education," on the other hand, contemplates work involving problems, necessitating adaptations, embracing the revision of techniques, and entailing the treatment of human situations; it presupposes concern with a definite body of knowledge, possession of intellectual responsibility, judgment, and initiative, and appreciation of the purposes and standards of the tasks in view; ^a in short, it implies whatever is prerequisite to practicing a profession. Examples naturally to be cited in illustrating these differences,

^a See ref. 387.

although not wholly precise in their analogy to librarianship, are the training of a nurse and the education of a physician; the study pursued, respectively, by intending solicitors and barristers in Great Britain; and the preparation which confines one engineer to operating a transit and enables another, by reason of scientific and social knowledge and the power of utilizing it, to build an industry or to plan and execute the construction of a tunnel, ship canal, or irrigation system. Their meaning has been set forth in the literature of the vocations generally,^b and to some degree in that dealing with librarianship.^c

Librarians too long have been content to refer to all forms of preparation as "training," even though this has belittled the more exacting aspects of their practice. It is true that the library schools of the early period foreshadowed the distinction between training and education by various changes already recounted; and it was recognized in such published statements as those of Illinois, to the effect that "students are taught their responsibility to the schools, to the clubs, to the factories, to university extension, and to the people as organized bodies and as individuals," and that the purpose was "to graduate educated as well as trained librarians."^d Later developments have confirmed this, as have also the policies of the Board of Education for Librarianship. The complete acknowledgment of the difference still lags, however, in spite of the advantages it might bring to the schools in their efforts to strengthen the curriculum, to librarians in recruiting their staffs and assigning appropriate duties, and to the profession at large in defining its status.

In view of the unlike levels of library work and the tendency of the schools to observe them, the differentiation between training and education applies readily to the qualifying of librarians. Training would seem to be concerned with

^b See refs. 183, 197, 248.

^c See refs. 13, 194.

^d See refs. 408, 409.

those mechanical or clerical processes which, as the early library schools relaxed emphasis upon them, began to be left to training classes and to apprenticeship. Education presumably looks to the technical and professional activities, and is the province of the library schools. These definitions are useful in testing the content and structure of the curriculum. The question they leave unsettled, namely, whether lines of any kind are to be drawn between the technical and professional aspects of education for librarianship, is being answered through the extensions of the curriculum. These, while not implying complete segregation, permit emphasis on technical matters in one discipline and on professional content in another, and locate the two in sequence. By so doing they recognize the diversity and overlapping of duties in library positions, and the fact that movement of an individual from one plane of work to another is likely to come by stages.

In applying to the library-school curriculum the distinction between training and education there are to be considered the major aims of the teaching, and the extent to which they are achievable. It is a truism that the requisites for professional practice, including that of the librarian, are knowledge, skills, and what for want of more concise phrasing may be referred to as traits, attitudes, and ideals. Accepting this, some conclusion must follow as to how far the qualities in question can and should be conveyed through the library-school curriculum. The imparting of knowledge patently deserves a large place, for familiarity must be given with the tools, resources, methods, history, and experience which pertain to library work; and this fits itself readily to the organization for which a curriculum stands. In fact, the view that the implanting of knowledge is the major task of a library school is hardly debatable, in spite of some uncertainties as to the suitable forms and extent of this knowledge.

What can be done about the inculcation of skills is less clear. This is partly because the abilities represented in library work are widely varied, including, for instance, the skill desirable in charging and discharging books, that essential in filing catalogue cards, that involved in assigning classification numbers and subject headings, that necessary in organizing and directing a staff, and that called for in diagnosing the needs of a reader or in dealing with a citizen who protests against some aspect of library policy. It is also partly because they are highly composite, and on the one hand are built upon knowledge and on the other hand rest upon traits, attitudes, and ideals. For example, the operations just cited depend respectively upon familiarity with certain card forms and mechanical devices, with alphabiting rules, with classification systems and the relations of subjects, as well as with human nature; but equally upon such capacities as manual dexterity, accuracy, discrimination, sagacity, and insight, which are derivable mainly from inheritance or educational processes having little to do with the accumulation of facts. Any means for producing the skills as a group which would take account of all the elements and suit the needs of all individuals would be complicated and time-consuming. Even if some satisfactory instructional formula could be devised it might help little, since preparation for clerical duties, in which training in skills is doubtless more practicable than elsewhere, is largely excluded; and since field work, which provides wide although relatively unsystematized opportunities for evolving them, belongs without the curriculum even if within the purview of the schools. All this seems to indicate that, as far as the inculcation of skills is concerned, a library school does best to concentrate upon the few which potentially are of high importance to all students; and that it can anticipate success to the extent that knowledge is the basis, or that the necessary traits are present or can be developed. The cataloguing

of books is an instance of a process in which, according to the above, students can be carried to a point of considerable practical competency.

The developing of traits, attitudes, and ideals involves questions similar in some respects to those met in the inculcation of skills. The outcomes which may be sought are diverse, because the requirements in various forms of library work differ widely. For example, although responsiveness and readiness to adjust are important in all candidates for library work of the more definitely professional types, some librarians may be called upon notably for the power of deliberate analysis and others for that of quick decision; some especially for interest in the means of preserving knowledge and others for human sympathy. Obviously no single prescription can ensure to each graduate all the cultivable traits which may be expected in him. Moreover, students customarily enter library schools with their characters formed.* Inheritance has determined in the main whether they are well endowed with some of the capacities desirable in their prospective work, such as judgment, initiative, and a sense of proportion; while the training of childhood and adolescence has settled largely whether they possess others, such as accuracy, neatness, and a social attitude. It might seem, in fact, that the concern with personal qualities open to the library school is minor, being limited to pointing the application, guiding the exercise, and encouraging the expression of such characteristics as already exist; and that perhaps the chief part of the schools in this connection lies in accepting only candidates whose suitability to library work is clearly demonstrated.

Particularly in the absence of conclusive admission tests, however, to be governed wholly by the foregoing would be to underestimate the possibilities of turning raw capacities

* See ref. 149.

to specific purposes, and to overlook the determination with which professional schools generally today are seeking to improve even upon the best student material, and thereby to evolve practitioners of the highest competence and the most genuine leadership. The effort of such schools is attested conspicuously by the commonly declared intention to prepare thinkers as well as technicians, the usual means for this being to provide such conditions of working as supposedly will render the practitioner adaptable and sufficient, however cases may change and whatever contingencies may arise.^f All this represents one form of recognition that professional education at its best does not result automatically from compliance with formal standards, however excellent and discriminating they may be, nor from faithful cultivation of the commonplace attainments. Likewise it means that while librarians of a kind may be made by implanting ample knowledge and a few skills, library schools which aim to keep pace with the best of their peers in other fields must aid their registrants, through the curriculum, to strengthen the serviceable qualities they possess, and if feasible to add to them. The Illinois statements ^g already quoted show that in this matter library schools as a group have not had to wait until the present or to look beyond their own ranks for guidance; as does also Plummer's counsel, given in 1901, that they hold in view "the education of the judgment of the individual."^h

The necessity for the development of traits, attitudes, and ideals is obvious enough when a loan-desk assistant in a library, however competent in some respects, repels patrons by discourtesy; or when a searcher fails to discover that a costly book proposed for purchase is already in his collection. It reveals itself still more strikingly when an administrator, who knows and professes the principles of personnel

^f See refs. 146, 147, 184, 261.

^g See refs. 408, 409.

^h See ref. 305.

management, nevertheless keeps individual members of his staff chronically in a state of tension. Granting that in some measure the qualities required in such cases are "the gift of the gods, not of the schools,"ⁱ it nevertheless rests with the schools to see that workers with serious personal shortcomings are not put into the field. And certainly it is to the interest of intending practitioners to be shown the probable cost to them, for example, of crudity, of brusque manners, and of superficiality; and that if correctives are needed these be pointed out.

If the influencing of students' traits, attitudes, and ideals signifies anything in the building of the curriculum, presumably it is that definite place and provision must be made for instruction looking toward it. Two views are held, in professional schools, as to how the matter should be introduced.^j One is that it can be presented most beneficially in connection with basic courses; for example, engineering students may be taught accuracy, thoroughness, and possibly regard for the individual and corporate interests which normally are party to an engineering enterprise, through a problem which simulates the laying out of a thoroughfare or a railroad line. The arguments for such a plan are that the lessons to be learned are likely to be most effective and least preachy when unfolded incidentally, and in a context which emphasizes their reasons and importance. The other opinion is that, at least for those sections of the teaching which have to do particularly with attitudes, somewhat distinct units should be set up, as exemplified in that devoted partly to the organization and ethics of the bench and bar at the Yale Law School,^k the lectures on medical ethics at the School of Medicine of Columbia University,^l and the full course on business ethics scheduled some years back at the Harvard

ⁱ See ref. 57.

^j See refs. 211, 336.

^k See ref. 462.

^l See ref. 127.

Graduate School of Business Administration.^m The advantages claimed for this arrangement are that it assures the subjects in question the attention they deserve, however time may press in the basic courses and whatever the propensities of individual instructors. So far, library schools would seem to have preferred the first-named plan; that is, they apparently have relied upon occasions bound to arise in the teaching, as they may be sensed by instructors, for the development of traits, attitudes, and ideals. Probably this is sound, assuming faculties which themselves have appropriate attitudes, and providing that in the make-up of courses ample leeway is allowed for the ancillary matter involved and for the more deliberate procedures which may be entailed. What is important is to assure that one of the two methods suggested above is employed as groundwork for the endeavors made through field assignments, through student guidance, and through the example and incidental classroom effort of teaching staffs generally, to foster in prospective librarians the personal qualities they need.

A distant view of the curriculum should aid also in deciding what comprehensiveness should be sought in constructing it. To begin with, how far in their preparation can it carry students? Professional schools generally doubtless have attempted to accomplish more through their curricula than is practicable. For example, pupils in schools of engineering commonly carry very heavy loads; and it has been charged that schools of medicine tend to exhaust their registrants with facts far in excess of the number retainable by any practitioner, instead of supplying them with leads and thus making clear that their school study is the beginning rather than the sum total of their professional education.ⁿ Library schools have been no exception to the rule, and perhaps have rivaled medical faculties in their desire to equip students

^m See ref. 199.

ⁿ See ref. 258.

with all the specifics they could need; and this despite ready acknowledgment that graduates cannot be sent into the field with the capacities of experts.^o The remedy in all such cases lies not in arbitrary restriction of matter, nor even alone in systematic investigation of what attainments library work requires, valuable as these may be, but in realizing that no professional school can do more than give its pupils a modest start, and that the qualities upon which self-propulsion and continued growth depend are dulled by surfeiting. Perhaps professional schools would come nearer to wisdom in this matter if they gave more heed to Lincoln Steffens's instructional rule-of-thumb, namely, that the thing to do is to teach adult students not facts and information but questions.^p

As regards refinement of form, as well as inclusiveness, it may be quite possible for a curriculum to be too near perfection. Flexner has pointed out in a classic paragraph—again in relation to schools of medicine—that the precisions sometimes sought by American curriculum builders tend to aid poor students little and to render superior ones dependent, meanwhile dissipating the energies of teachers and centering their attention upon minor aspects of their presentation.^q Such a weakness is as fatal to genuine professional education as is an over-full or congested curriculum; and its discovery and correction may well be a major concern where curricula are being scrutinized and rebuilt. Library schools have not been given so far to unduly nice curriculum organization, but their wish to do the utmost possible for students undoubtedly leads them in that direction; and they may need to be on guard lest mechanical perfections, commendable as such, relieve classes of those solutions and syntheses which are vital to individual development and to successful practice.

^o See refs. 142, 193, 275, 354.

^p See ref. 374.

^q See ref. 179.

Another aid to proper perspective lies in defining as objectively as possible just what the relation of professional schools should be to their fields. Control by individual and organized practitioners is a factor here, the oversight in some cases being effective to a high degree, although ordinarily indirect; ^r the extent to which it has operated with library schools is treated in Chapter IV of this volume. As far as a curriculum is concerned the chief question is how immediate its response should be to changes of practice or of opinion in the field. Such adaptations tend to be deliberate, due to uncertainty and to inertia, and despite the desire of faculties to keep their instruction in step with practice; extreme fluidity in professional schools is not unknown, however, witness the custom at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration of shifting subjects back and forth with little formality and as field situations and teaching advantages recommend. Generally speaking, the axioms would seem to be that accommodations should be prompt without being precipitate; and that a curriculum should not lose its stability, even though a faculty may be committed to experimentation. In the case of library schools there was no need to remodel schemes of instruction extensively because of the war service of libraries in 1917-19 or the prominence of national planning after 1930, even though these developments called for attention in the teaching. As previously suggested, however, cumulative happenings of recent years point to marked revisals, some of which are in effect. For example, the enlarging responsibilities of libraries indicate fuller and more catholic consideration of their place in communities and institutions, and of the assumptions underlying their service; also, the tendencies toward departmentalization within libraries point to changed groupings of matter, such as unified treatment of whatever

^r See refs. 191, 342, 430, 443.

relates to the content and use of books. Again, the increasing emphasis upon scholarly aspects of library work, besides heightening the importance of subject knowledge, has led some teachers of classification and cataloguing to make their approach through the substance of books rather than through systems and details of organization,^{*} and even suggests that courses in classification might be most effective if they placed the study of schemes and notations definitely subordinate to that of literature and sources. Finally, with library catalogues approaching their limits in bulk and cost, intending cataloguers must be prepared increasingly for the use of short forms of entry, for the extension of co-operative systems, and indeed for the partial replacement of catalogues by other tools. Readiness and success in making such adjustments is indeed a test of competence in a school; an even more convincing proof of this is willingness on the part of a faculty to undertake a given change only when its correctness or the need for experimenting with it has been demonstrated.

It is not certain, however, that professional schools ought to stop with adaptation. Should they be satisfied to reflect usage, on the ground that only so can they be certain of fitting students for whatever may be met; or should they aim avowedly to influence practice through their instruction? They differ widely in their views on this question, depending upon their traditions, their environments, their means, and the personalities making up their staffs. Library schools generally have taken the conservative side, partly at least because they never have controlled the resources necessary for blazing new paths. Plummer, in 1913, ventured that library schools should report and perhaps forecast, rather than practice, innovations,[†] an opinion which later was endorsed by Donnelly;[‡] and to the present the tendency is to hold that policies and the curriculum must be shaped

* See ref. 255.

† See ref. 304.

‡ See ref. 149.

chiefly by the calls which reach the placement desk. Certainly students cannot afford and schools must not feature preparation which fails to be tuned to field requirements. At the same time, opportunities do come for forward steps. A faculty might devise a new technique for rating books by difficulty of vocabulary, for instance, and equip its students to use it; or see merit in a fresh form of staff organization, and pave the way for its acceptance by emphasizing it. Again, given applicants who were willing to take the chances involved in specialized preparation, a product might be turned out which would encourage libraries to inaugurate a more thoroughgoing division of labor. It would seem practicable for library schools, while holding in the main to conventional procedures, not to avoid prophecy entirely. To assume some of the risks of leadership in improving practice doubtless would enhance their prestige, and mark them as asserting a generous interpretation of their responsibility. Incidentally, it would tend to free them from that preoccupation with proximate ends which is the root of many shortcomings in curricula, teachers, and schools generally.

The canons of professional education touched above provide a background for examining the spread of function proper in the professional schools of any particular group. What the offices of such schools are might seem evident; but certainly in the case of library schools confusion on the point has prevailed from the start. The leaders of the library movement in the early days, inspired by the unfolding vision of possible service, were not concerned to draw nice distinctions or to establish fine distributions of responsibility. Some device was needed to turn more people into library work, and that quickly. The one most notably adopted, namely, the library school, became by pre-emption and default the agency not alone for training but in large degree that for recruit-

ing, selecting, measuring, accrediting, placing, and apprenticing. As a result the profession, with inadequate analysis, has allowed and even pressed the schools to carry an unduly heavy and composite task. The matter is sufficiently important to justify some examination of the activities, apart from teaching and exploration, which library schools traditionally have assumed.

As regards recruiting, the stimulation of interest in librarianship in the pioneer days was peculiar in that little was to offer beyond the missionary's lot and the devotee's compensations. Personal representations to individual prospects were an appropriate step in whatever efforts were undertaken. Responsibility for this may well have lodged naturally, though not exclusively, with those in charge of library schools. Today, however, recruiting must be recognized as a problem for library schools only to the degree that it is so for the profession at large. There is but one influence that can be counted upon in the long run to draw such candidates as are required, namely, the examples before them of libraries competently organized, adequately staffed, and amply financed. In other words, the work itself must do the recruiting. Library schools of course may share in building up the examples and in making known the opportunities springing from them. This granted, their remaining part is so to equip and conduct themselves that observers shall be convinced of their worth, and inferentially of the attractions of library work. This is a material task, since resources, staff, and management are involved; it brings no burden, but rather strengthens the schools; and it represents no more than institutions of any kind should do by way of putting their houses in order, regardless of other aims.

The responsibility for selecting which falls properly to library schools sometimes has been exaggerated, even to the point of suggesting that it is pre-eminent among their

duties and of implying that they should prevent all misfits.⁷ This may have had force when preparation for only a small number of libraries was to be considered, and when library work was homogeneous and applicants were few. Under present conditions it is too much to expect, however; even granting that, as stated in Chapter XI, the schools are bound to harmonize their choice of students with field conditions. For one thing, it would demand both more knowledge of prospective avenues of opportunity than is likely to be available, and more exact prognoses than are derivable so far from the records, experience, and personalities of candidates. Moreover, while a nicely-planned co-ordination of admissions with the requirements of libraries appears sensible, it involves more abridgment than is popular of the liberty to secure an education and then to swim or sink. For the most part therefore the schools can sift only by administering effectively such entrance conditions as suit the field as a whole, and by care and discrimination in recommending graduates for positions.

Closely bound up with selecting is the task of measuring, which troubles teachers in schools generally because it is irrelevant to, and yet often is inseparable from, their main office. In library schools its necessity lies chiefly in the desire of librarians for judgments on the capacities of students and graduates whom they consider for appointment. Within limits this expectation is reasonable, for faculties should know something of individuals' abilities after a year's observation. It is to be remembered, however, that school conditions differ from those in libraries, that the circumstances and incentives in a school year for a given student may be abnormal, and that even if the appraising could be precise, predictions based on school records could not be made with certainty. If faculties do their best in measuring,

⁷ See refs. 164, 441.

perhaps by means of comprehensive examinations as well as through the usual devices in course; and if employers use with discretion the data furnished by the schools, there still are probabilities of error. The real test of the estimating, as of the selecting, must be the performance after appointment. This implies no lightening of the schools' obligations, but it does call for recognition that these obligations are limited.

Accrediting is related closely to measuring, since the formal way of registering an opinion concerning a student is the award of a credential. Certificates, diplomas, and degrees apparently must be recognized as having a place, if only because they are a part of the scholastic tradition and the professional pattern of thought. The way to assure their significance is to insist that their bestowal shall rest upon matured demonstration of competence. In the ordinary course of events this presupposes student performance under curriculum conditions, subject to faculty observation over a prolonged period. It means that only in exceptional cases can enough data regarding an individual to warrant the granting of a credential be assembled in any other manner. The burden of proof emphatically lies with those who would ask schools to measure and judge upon alternative grounds. It is entirely reasonable, of course, that persons who have acquired qualifications comparable to those of library-school graduates, but who have done so by experience and independent effort rather than by library-school study, should covet some certification of their status. It is equally fair that workers who plan formal, professional education, but who are anxious to spend no unnecessary time in the process, should be able to claim recognition for those fractions of it which they already may have covered. The opportunity for all this should be provided by every profession, at least in the developmental stages; the question in the case of librarianship is not whether it is needed, but how and by what

agency it can be accomplished. If any clear duty in the matter rests with the library schools it is to seek the necessary techniques and to be ready to apply them freely with applicants for advanced standing or for modified programs. Only by declining to extend their measuring activities beyond this can library schools safeguard such accrediting as is the natural by-product of the curriculum.

As concerns placing, so long as library schools are the most reliable sources of information about candidates for positions, so long undoubtedly will librarians expect them to furnish employment service. This aspect of their activity, however, sometimes has been unduly magnified. To whatever extent library schools come to be looked upon as primarily gateways to positions, and in whatever degree this compromises the sincerity and self-dependence of students and graduates, by just so much the situation is debilitating. Likewise if, incident to placement work, the schools are suspected of efforts to manipulate or dominate, the effects may be divisive to librarianship; although always it is to be remembered that they rightly have at heart the interests of candidates in much larger measure than would be the case with commercial agencies. Finally, the cost of employment service is of moment to the schools. This is a material item, considering the salaries of officers, clerks, and stenographers, and the expense of office space and equipment for them; and since the activity largely is barren of returns, it becomes a contribution to the graduate body and to the profession. Granting that the schools are obliged by circumstances to continue as placement agencies, therefore, they should be recognized as doing this at sacrifice to themselves and at the risk of possible injury to the profession.

Apprenticing, as the term is here used, consists of such assignments in libraries as are designed to assure drill and facility in the performance of library processes. Since it takes

predominantly the form of the field work discussed in Chapter VIII, little further argument is necessary as to its place. It was magnified in the early days, and it admittedly is important; but its unfitness for the curriculum should spell its diminution as a school function. If provided for by entrance requirements, or in recesses, or following graduation, a school properly may evaluate it or even give it some supervision; but the accountability ought hardly to go beyond this.

All the duties that could be attributed to library schools would not make a long list, considered topically; and it may seem that those mentioned above are the larger part of it. Should the schools disavow these offices; and if so, would their reasons for existence be weakened? The most obvious reply to this is that participation in recruiting, selecting, measuring, accrediting, placing, and apprenticing, in varying forms and degrees, is still unavoidable; conditions do not warrant renouncing it, even though they do call for its discriminating direction and for scrutiny of its extent. A more significant answer is that in proportion as conditions permit the schools to diminish or revise their attention to the responsibilities named, in just that degree will they be able to concentrate on their primary function. The positive principle inescapable in any thoroughgoing consideration of school activities is that the first task is to instruct; and this merits particular emphasis in the case of library schools. Teaching, plus the exploratory and productive effort contributory to it on the part of faculties, should come near to constituting the sum of their duties. Other obligations should be carried only as required by institutional practice or in deference to the needs of an incompletely developed profession; and should not entail a drain upon their resources, or introduce confusion in pedagogical aim, or blunt the incentive to excel in teaching.

Expedients are defensible and often necessary in the initiation of new undertakings, and as part of the library movement the early schools were justified in being busy in many directions. With the labor of librarianship becoming highly divided, however, each individual and each institution is under pressure to observe logical delimitations in function, to appropriate no larger area than can be cultivated effectively, and both to respect the claims and insist on the responsibilities of co-workers. The implication of this for library schools is clear.

XI

CONDITIONS FOR THE CURRICULUM

THE major tasks of a professional-school faculty plainly are the building of a curriculum and its subsequent operation. If the first of these has been completed, and if arrangements have been made for supplementing the curriculum adequately and for locating it suitably, success still depends upon the manner and circumstances of carrying it out. The curriculum might in fact be likened to a vehicle, subject to limitations in capacity and mileage and dependent partly for its efficiency upon finding a prepared road. The limitations already have been indicated; the road may be provided by competent teaching, by favorable instructional circumstances, including the essential resources and equipment, and by selection of a properly-qualified student body. Neither of these requisites can be treated comprehensively here, since the full gamut of teaching and administrative problems is involved; but it is in order to point out their elements and to suggest some of the means helpful in giving them effect.

Instructional standards and procedures have been so near a concern with higher educational institutions in recent years that attention to them on the part of library schools requires no explanation. Public interest, pressure from practitioners, and study by faculties, as well as the efforts of accrediting bodies and educational foundations, all have been directed toward remedying weaknesses and repairing omissions. In this connection there has been much generalizing about what constitutes good teaching. Some have emphasized cogent organization of courses; painstaking prep-

aration of material; discriminating use of assignments; convincing presentation, through appropriate classroom devices; and informed treatment of the measuring function, with correct appreciation of its ends and conversance with the necessary techniques. Others have stressed the place of thorough knowledge, vivified by the imaginative and interpretative qualities which give schools and teachers their reason for being^a and quickened by wholesome example and the power to stimulate. While there is nothing new in all this, it is significant that professional schools, including library schools, show eagerness to apply it.

In the chief move toward competent instruction, namely, the judicious choice of teachers, the usage of library schools exhibits encouraging development. Originally the faculties for the most part were practitioners, sometimes drawn from their duties in affiliated libraries for such time as they could give to class work.^b This was natural, since the schools existed commonly in close association with libraries, if not as divisions or offshoots of them,^c and operated on the slenderest of means. It meant apparently that familiarity with library processes, supported by zeal for the cause represented by library schools, was the outstanding characteristic and probably was put foremost in making appointments. This requirement has continued its primacy, partly because underlying conditions have changed but slowly, and partly perhaps because among higher educational institutions generally the capacity to teach has been defined mainly in terms of knowledge. The recognition has grown among library schools and librarians, however, that other qualities demand consideration. At a relatively early date Pratt Institute began selecting for school posts those among the heads of its library departments who gave promise of success as teachers, and New

^a See refs. 117, 442.

^c See refs. 107, 109, 156, 314, 354.

^b See refs. 107, 161, 369, 411.

York State saw the importance of such faculty arrangements as would promote competence in instruction.^d These schools, and others later, came to realize that the conversance with library work and procedures which springs from experience, indispensable as it may be, is no guarantee of effectiveness in the classroom; and that ability in teaching as such is a desideratum, whether based upon native traits, upon formal study, upon prior service in schools, or upon combinations of these. Also, thorough general and professional education, the badges of which increasingly are degrees gained in academic and professional institutions, have become accepted as necessary. The question today with an administrator is likely to be not whether all these attributes are important but how to measure them, which to put first in individual instances, and how far to insist upon them in view of budget limitations. The Board of Education for Librarianship has helped to fix thought upon the general problem by means of its standards,^e and some of the library schools have sought to further its solution by offering specialized programs for persons who contemplate library-school teaching.^f Some professional schools in other fields incidentally are providing suggestive examples, the Yale Divinity School asking instructional experience or competent formal preparation in candidates for faculty positions, and the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration making it a practice to look for definite evidence of teaching capacity. As the resources of library schools permit, their effort obviously should be to build staffs whose equipment for instruction and the attendant activities is complete; thus escaping the dilemma of choice among requisites, and avoiding disproportionate emphasis, for illustration, either upon theory as against application, or upon teaching techniques as against subject matter.

Assuming sufficiently qualified faculties, they require ad-

^d See ref. 369.

^e See refs. 10, 16.

^f See refs. 120, 398.

vantageous conditions for their activity. Everything that touches the morale of any working group is involved here, beginning with the elementary comforts and conveniences and extending to adequate remuneration. It is mainly to the assignment and regulation of duties, however, that attention is due by library schools. First of all it follows, if instructors are to be selected only after scrutiny of their qualifications, that they should carry the kinds of teaching in which their gifts and interests count most. Sometimes they have been obliged, as have secondary-school teachers, to handle subjects only slightly related to their preparation, and teaching allocations within faculties have seemed to be made with inadequate care, if not casually. This may have been excusable in a measure when schools were hard pressed, as often they have been, but should not happen as an accepted thing.

An equally urgent need is that of keeping the service load within efficient limits, which library schools traditionally have neglected. Such control may be compassed by restricting the number and size of classes, by concentrating an individual's assignment within a narrow range of courses, by limiting the demands made by committee work and administrative duties, and by the provision of understudies, revisers, and other aids.⁹ Some alleviation along these lines has appeared in recent years, the supplying of assistants having become more liberal and the tendency having increased to adjust loads with reference to what is fair and practicable as well as with thought of the ground to be covered. Breakdown no longer is a necessary hazard, and ineffectiveness ordinarily cannot be blamed to an overheavy schedule. It remains, however, to release the time and to furnish the help which will allow amply for contacts with libraries, for work for professional organizations, and for study, investigation, and writing. All of these activities are essential if the

⁹ See refs. 2, 231, 332.

teaching is to be vitalized and progressively enriched;^h and the avenues for them are inviting. Among library schools opportunities appear not only in visiting libraries, in committee activity, and in individual productivity, but in such surveys of libraries as the Columbia University of Library Service has carried out, and in the service studies featured at the University of Chicago Graduate Library School. Elsewhere they are exemplified in the sharing by instructors in field undertakings at the New York School of Social Work, and in the participation by members of professional faculties at Yale University in the program of the Institute of Human Relations. The need of a formula for gauging service loads has been discussed widely in relation to higher educational institutions, but perhaps the best way to meet the problem is to live beyond its area of relevance, which might be done by allowing teachers a clear surplus of time and then holding them responsible for profitable use of it. Particularly in view of the amount and variety of investigation that cries for attention in the sphere of librarianship, this is a desirable goal for library schools, whether or not it contains an answer to their immediate service-load problems.

Wise selection of a staff, together with circumstances auspicious for its work, imply machinery for watching and controlling the standards of teaching. While instructors on the higher levels dislike supervision, they hardly can object to making efforts for improvement or ask to be the sole judges of results. Inspection of their performance in class is legitimate, but often disturbing and unprofitable, and probably is unnecessary. Ample opportunities arise for noting how teachers express themselves, how they organize their presentation, and how fully their personal characteristics meet requirements. Also, it is in order to ask that data regarding course work be submitted systematically, and thus

^h See refs. 4, 213, 431.

to ascertain not only whether instructors are living up to their assignments and to the understandings touching them but whether their courses harmonize with the purposes and principles underlying the curriculum as a whole. Through these two methods—the observation of teachers outside the classroom and the scrutiny of their plans and materials—many of the criteria which should control the building of a curriculum can be applied to the instruction;¹ and when amplified by systematic testing of the product, they afford probably as complete measures of efficiency as can be utilized under present library-school conditions. Their full adoption would mean material increase of the administrative routines, indicating thereby that the service loads of deans and office staffs, as well as of teachers, are related to the curriculum.

A corollary to the maintenance of standards with an existing staff is an attempt to advance them. Professional schools and groups of recent years have been active in this, and library schools and librarians by no means have been the last among them. The most direct and ambitious endeavor probably is the series of summer institutes for teachers of engineering which for years has been sponsored by the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, comparable to which were the institutes for library-school instructors conducted in the summers of 1926-27 under direction of the Board of Education for Librarianship. The programs for prospective library-school teachers already mentioned, which are analogous to opportunities provided by some schools of theology, law, and business, offer also an avenue of in-service improvement. Doubtless what count most, however, are the simple means feasible from month to month in any school, if its faculty is actuated by eagerness to raise the level of efficiency. Occasional conferences on teaching problems may be the acceptable method in one set of circumstances, and

¹ See ref. 182.

formal study of them in another. The essential is not to let the standards remain stationary, but to environ the curriculum with the search and struggle for higher excellence in presentation of its matter.ⁱ

One way of sustaining and raising instructional standards is to keep the curriculum itself under review. This normally would take direction from the principles governing its original construction, and would mean adaptation to experience and to new views and conditions. Professional schools in other fields are found to manage their revisions in a variety of ways, sometimes overturning a curriculum completely after a period of inquiry and planning; sometimes amending intermittently, and purposely so, in order to allow time for the gauging of results; sometimes working on the problem constantly, with the aim of introducing minor changes as occasion appears; and sometimes having no set program, but regarding all curriculum arrangements as experimental and being prepared to alter them when and as circumstances may demand. As regards effects upon the teaching, the mode of action followed and the devices employed may be of secondary importance. A happy medium is wholesome, so that the extremes both of fixity and instability may be avoided; but what matters most is alertness to the value of some such procedure.

Good teaching has anything but a material basis, and yet in a library school it cannot be expected to flourish in the absence of such resources and equipment as constitute its tools. Together with an extensive and specialized book collection, ample working quarters and appropriate furniture and furnishings are called for, not only because they are vital to classroom work, but because laboratory exercises and problems enter heavily into student assignments. In a sense they measure the fitness of an institution to undertake

ⁱ See ref. 5.

library-school instruction, for although sumptuousness is not necessary, adequacy is. College and university authorities at times have failed to appreciate some aspects of this, overlooking that library schools are comparable in their physical requirements to schools of architecture and of dentistry rather than to schools of law or of business. It is likely, moreover, that an institution unaware of what equipment library-school teaching requires will allocate relatively as little money to salaries and to administration as to books and quarters; and that it will content itself with a staff insufficient in numbers, so that classes may be over-large and service loads badly adjusted. Under such circumstances the conduct of the curriculum is bound to suffer.

The safe guide in assuring capable instruction, viewed from whatever angle, is to keep the teaching function pre-eminent, as suggested in Chapter X. This is one of the respects in which the affiliating of library schools with universities has proved to be an aid. The several subsidiary activities which in their days of detachment divided seriously the energies of library-school faculties have receded somewhat, and teaching and the duties ancillary to it seem on the way to enjoy new dignity and to command improved compensation. With the change, there already have appeared some of the new emphases here urged as requisite to a favorable setting for the curriculum, namely, improved staff personnel, more salutary working conditions, greater attention to standards of competence, and perhaps more concern for reviewing the curriculum and even for providing suitable equipment and resources. In direct proportion to such effort the curriculum receives the support it needs.

To assemble from year to year a student body upon which the curriculum can play with best effect involves harmony of both with the recruiting assumptions according to which

a school operates. Theoretically it is simple, in spite of difficulties in application. If these assumptions have altered, or if classes conforming to them cease to be available, the time has come for accommodation both in the curriculum and in the criteria of selection; and it should always be feasible, allowing for some necessary lag, to keep classes and curriculum reasonably suited to each other. As already indicated and as is true with other callings, however, the problem is to secure conclusive data about field conditions, and particularly about those of the future. Although cognizant of the developments described in Chapter II of this volume, the library schools and the other groups and individuals concerned still fall short of knowing with definiteness how far impending changes in library practice warrant innovations in instruction, and still less just what kinds of librarians promise to be required for two or three decades ahead. Committees of the American Library Association have given thought to this;^{*} and, incidentally, students of library-school problems have explored means for translating into admission procedures ascertained facts regarding library work and the curriculum.¹ Incidentally reliable forecasting has claimed new attention by reason of the excess of candidates over vacancies which the years since 1930 have brought; for whatever adjusting of enrollment to the market may be attempted, it should rest not upon impressions or momentary appearances, but upon studied appraisal of needs.

Since field conditions, admission standards, and the curriculum are variables, no one can be dogmatic about the qualifications correct in a student body. Moreover, through their relations to accrediting agencies professional schools generally have sensed the embarrassment potential in over-rigid entrance specifications. There may be profit in glancing

^{*} See refs. 8, 44, 331.

¹ See refs. 140, 429.

at the requirements commonly imposed by library schools, however, and in considering, first, how well they suit present-day necessities and, second, what are the probable avenues of future change.

Superficially considered, it might be sufficient merely to inquire how well the library-school students of today are fitted to pursue the curriculum. In fact the Board of Education for Librarianship, in the desire to allow for reasonable exceptions, stipulated in its early pronouncements that schools might reserve the right to admit persons able "to carry the work without a lowering of standards," even though such applicants lacked the ordinary academic attainments.^m This opened the door for dubious substitutions and begged the central question, since qualifications for work in libraries rather than in a library school primarily are what should be assured in candidates; and since satisfactory school performance can be only an incomplete evidence of these. Individuals quite unsuited to practice have been known to do well in library schools. What is more relevant to ask is whether the admissions criteria usually employed are adequate to field needs as these are understood, and whether they are administered effectively from the standpoint of library service; if they are, and if the curriculum itself is in line with the service, it may be supposed that the entrance standards are giving all the aid they can to the curriculum.

The requirement upon which both the schools and librarians have centered thought in recent years is a college education. Because when this was introduced it looked high, it was regarded as a convenient initial eliminator. As implied in preceding chapters, there scarcely can be doubt as to its formal appropriateness. The question is whether the accomplishments which a college degree is supposed to betoken, considerable as they sometimes have appeared, today are

^m See ref. 10.

sufficient; and whether, if they are not, adequacy can be hoped for until the reorganization under way in American colleges has been achieved. It is complicated by the facts that in practice subject knowledge varies in its value according to positions; that certain foreign languages are indispensable for some forms of work and not at all so for others; and that standards of attainment differ from college to college. The expectation seems fair that some of those who in past years have stood most firmly for the degree requirement may be willing, now that their battle has been won, to join their former opponents in asking more significant proofs of education. New measuring devices easily might furnish criteria at this point, particularly if they comprehend not only information and facts, but the sources of these as represented in the printed word and in books; and if they do not neglect the few skills which are desirable elements of a liberal education, such as written expression. They also should give the schools better ground for suggesting or prescribing specific preprofessional programs; and although, owing to the diversity of library work ² such recommendations still might need to be elastic, they probably could be so strengthened as to show more plausibly their relation to the careers of graduates.

Important as academic accomplishment is, the evaluation of it tends to be routinized, so that more and more the attention may be centered elsewhere. This brings to the fore anew personal qualities, for even when the market is full library schools do not reject applicants who are well educated and stand high in aptitudes and attitudes. In the admission standards still other requisites or considerations may appear, such as library experience and suitable reading habits, but in reality these represent largely means of gaining or confirming evidence as to personal attributes. The facts that the

² See refs. 102, 210.

desirable traits are elusive and unclassifiable, and that there is as wide variety in the characteristics as in the knowledge serviceable to librarians, excuse neither unconcern regarding them nor superficial measures for detecting them. Library schools generally cannot be convicted of carelessness on these points, although they exhibit differences of view; some exalting certain personal qualifications before all else, and others being disposed, after other conditions are met, to admit all candidates except such as show unsuitable traits in marked degree, and to leave further choice and sifting to circumstances in the field. The possible error of the first of these policies is that too narrow or inflexible a conception of the capacities needed in library work may prevail; and of the second, that more than the unavoidable minimum of lumber may be turned into the profession. It is significant that here, as in the case of educational requirements, such conflicts of attitude as exist probably could be reconciled by the perfecting and adoption of adequate tests.⁹ Since such measures would presuppose agreement upon criteria of success in practice¹⁰ and upon the gifts suited to this, and since they would probe all relevant sectors of the personality and yield data of significance in all forms of library work, there would be left little about which to differ. Having settled upon the type of librarians it wishes to produce, each school would find its eligible list made up automatically. All this looks utopian, since neither criteria of success nor agreement on combinations of desired qualities is in sight, to say nothing of full batteries of tests; but it indicates the road toward precision in admission practices.

The steps suggested above actually might have more effect in improving procedures than in lifting standards. Although they would help to fit entrance conditions to needs with greater assurance, they would not necessarily introduce any

⁹ See refs. 208, 260.

¹⁰ See refs. 71, 150.

new requirement. Perhaps the only feature that could be added, after all the aspects of educational and personal equipment had been considered, is that of prior experience in libraries. As already has been indicated, this would throw light on personal qualifications, and insofar as it might increase the homogeneity of student bodies it would simplify the problems both of drafting the curriculum and of teaching. It certainly is not essential as a means of ascertaining the aptitude of candidates, however, and its place seems too questionable to warrant adoption as an aid to instruction. The usefulness of such experience is doubtful, as concerns preparation for schooling, because it is next to impossible to secure in uniform and satisfactory character. It is not comparable to those accomplishments which individuals must attain by the time they have reached maturity or never; it can be gained later, and perhaps more effectively so. To insist that applicants attach themselves to libraries for stated periods before admission might confuse the main purpose of practical work, which is not so much to furnish prognosis as to amplify education in ways that a school can do little to promote. Finally, to make it an absolute entrance condition would be like saying to prospective students that in order to practice they must study, but that in order to begin their study they must practice. Other professional schools, incidentally, offer little precedent for treating it as a prerequisite.

Whatever regulations for entrance to library schools prevail, latitude of course is desirable for exceptions. Peculiar field circumstances occasionally claim consideration, and candidates present themselves whose qualifications are fit but uncommon. What is essential in such instances is to apply the spirit of the usual requirements, bearing in mind that if this is correct, departure from it can benefit no one; and using the best criteria and measures available for es-

tablishing equivalents. The exceptions sought may be expected to yield significant evidence as to whether existing admission rules are in accord with current needs.

The selection of students is one of the points at which a library school is right to be jealous of its prerogative. There may be times when it must stand upon its own interpretation of field conditions and resist clamor on the part of its own clientele, although happily such a necessity is apt to be rare. Again, self-assertion may be called for in upholding standards which it and librarians agree upon against the practices and pressure of its sponsoring institution. This contingency has never been sufficiently serious to prejudice the schools against university or college affiliation, but security lies in unimpaired power of rejection, no matter how fully the scrutiny of academic fitness may be left to a general admissions office.² A similar safeguard would be requisite if, as has been suggested, a central agency should come to act for all the schools in passing upon the number and qualifications of applicants.³ In each case there is at stake the aptness of people for library work, as well as the consonance of the student body with the curriculum.

There are some characteristics of registrants in library schools which predispose to success with the curriculum, even though the accommodation to individual needs may not always be exact. Because of their maturity, their professional objective and the material investment they are making, classes are earnest, teachable, and punctilious. Feeling responsibility for their own growth, they are ready to meet faculties more than half way. The imperfections inevitable in any curriculum, therefore, are likely to be compensated for in part by student effort. Supplementary devices can be used safely as such, field work being productive and profitable even when its organization is imperfect, and

² See ref. 123.

³ See ref. 126.

student guidance being self-motivating, and best so. This is not to palliate looseness, but to suggest that after the curriculum has been set up, and after competent teaching has been assured, there need be anticipated no failure in student co-operation. The conditions needed ordinarily will be sufficient if the school and its supporting institution have done their parts.

*

REFERENCES

*

ABBREVIATIONS

A.L.A.	American Library Association
A.L.A. Bull.	American Library Association Bulletin
A.A.L.S.	Association of American Library Schools
Lib. Jour.	Library Journal
Lib. Quart.	Library Quarterly
Sch. and Soc.	School and Society

REFERENCES

1. Akers, S. G. Relation of the Professional and Clerical Division of Cataloging Activities to Cataloging Courses. *Lib. Quart.*, V: 101-36.
2. Almack, J. C., and Lang, A. R. Problems of the Teaching Profession, c1925. Ch. xi.
3. American Association of Dental Schools. Course of Study in Dentistry, 1935.
4. American Association of University Professors. Committee on College and University Teaching. Report, 1933. p. 22, 55.
5. ——— Same, p. 26-27, 33, 74-78.
6. American Correspondence School of Librarianship. *Lib. Jour.*, XLVIII: 802.
7. American Council on Education. Committee on Graduate Instruction. Report, 1934. (Relationship of scientific instruction on the graduate level in a professional school to scientific instruction in a graduate school.) *Educational Record*, XV: 231-34.
8. American Library Association. Advisory Board for the Study of Special Projects. Annual report, 1933. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVII: 450-52; same, 1935. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXIX: 344-45.
9. American Library Association. Board of Education for Librarianship. Annual report, 1925. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XIX: 226-63.
10. ——— Same, 1926. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XX: 405-73.
11. ——— Same, 1931. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXV: 190-217.
12. ——— Same, 1933. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVII: 427-33.
13. ——— Same, 1934. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVIII: 290-97.
14. ——— Same, 1935. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXIX: 308-15.
15. ——— Discussion of Summer Courses in Librarianship, *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVI: 524-27.
16. ——— Minimum requirements for library schools, 1933. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVII: 610-13.
17. ——— Standard Terminology in Education, with Special Reference to Librarianship. Provisional edition, 1927. Mimeographed.

18. American Library Association. Committee on Library School. Library School as It Is. Lib. Jour., XV: C91-93.
19. ——— Library School as It Should Be. Lib. Jour., XV: C93-94.
20. ——— . . . Report[s] on the Library School, 1892. Lib. Jour., XVII: C31-34.
21. American Library Association. Committee on Library School and Training Classes. Report, 1894. Lib. Jour., XIX: C116-20.
22. ——— Same, 1895. Lib. Jour., XX: C61-63.
23. American Library Association. Committee on Library Schools. Report, 1896. Lib. Jour., XXI: C93-97.
24. ——— Same, 1897. Lib. Jour., XXII: C87-90.
25. ——— Same, 1899. Lib. Jour., XXIV: C115-16.
26. ——— Same, 1900. Lib. Jour., XXV: C83-86.
27. American Library Association. Committee on Library Terminology. Annual Report, 1933. A.L.A. Bull., XXVII: 465; same, 1934. A.L.A. Bull., XXVIII: 347-48; same, 1935. A.L.A. Bull., XXIX: 371-72.
28. American Library Association. Committee on Library Training. Report, 1901. Lib. Jour., XXVI: 685-86.
29. ——— Same, 1902. Lib. Jour., XXVII: C135-36.
30. ——— Same, 1903. Lib. Jour., XXVIII: C83-98.
31. ——— Same, 1905. Lib. Jour., XXX: C121-23.
32. ——— Same, 1907. A.L.A. Bull., I: 108-10.
33. ——— Same, 1908. A.L.A. Bull., II: 199-203.
34. ——— Same, 1910. A.L.A. Bull., IV: 642-43.
35. ——— Same, 1911. A.L.A. Bull., V: 77-78.
36. ——— Same, 1914. A.L.A. Bull., VIII: 104-7.
37. ——— Same, 1915. A.L.A. Bull., IX: 227-29.
38. ——— Same, 1916. A.L.A. Bull., X: 348-49.
39. ——— Same, 1917. A.L.A. Bull., XI: 275-92.
40. ——— Same, 1918. A.L.A. Bull., XII: 260-61.
41. ——— Same, 1920. A.L.A. Bull., XIV: 284-89.
42. ——— Same, 1921. A.L.A. Annual Reports, 1921. p. 66-69.
43. American Library Association. Committee on Public Administration of Public Libraries. Annual Report, 1933. A.L.A. Bull., XXVII: 466-67.

44. American Library Association. Committee on Recruiting for Library Service. Report, 1933. A.L.A. Bull., XXVII: 469.
45. American Library Association. Committee on School of Library Economy. Report, 1883. Lib. Jour., VIII: 293-94.
46. American Library Association. Committee on Standardizing Library Courses in Normal Schools. Report, 1915. A.L.A. Bull., IX: 280-82.
47. American Library Association. Committee on the Proposed School of Library Economy. Report, 1885. Lib. Jour., X: 291-94.
48. American Library Association. Council. Minutes, June 26, 1909. A.L.A. Bull., III: 441-43.
49. ——— Standards for Public Libraries. Adopted October, 1933. A.L.A. Bull., XXVII: 513-14.
50. American Library Association. Hospital Libraries Round Table. Discussion. A.L.A. Bull., XX: 509-14.
51. American Library Association. Professional Training Section. [Report of Meeting], May 29, 1928. A.L.A. Bull., XXII: 448-50.
52. American Library Association. Secretary. Report, 1933. A.L.A. Bull., XXVII: 417-24.
53. American Library Association. Section for Library Work with Children. Professional Training Committee. Training of Children's Librarians, 1933. Mimeographed.
54. American Library Association. Temporary Library Training Board. Report, 1924. p. 7.
55. American Medical Association. Council on Medical Education and Hospitals. Essentials of an Acceptable Medical School, 1933. p. 2-3.
56. American School of Librarianship. Lib. Jour., L: 78-79.
57. Anderson, E. H. [Remarks on Paper by Chalmers Hadley] A.L.A. Bull., VI: 153-54.
58. Armour Institute. Department of Library Science, 1894-95.
59. Armour Institute. Library. Preliminary Circular of Information, 1893(?).
60. Association of American Library Schools. Constitution, 1915. Mimeographed.
61. ——— Minutes of Meeting, June 25-26, 1923. p. 18-19. Mimeographed.

62. Association of American Library Schools. Proceedings, 1915-date. Mimeographed.
63. Association of American Library Schools. Committee on Cataloging Instruction. Report. A.A.L.S. Proceedings, 1924. p. 17-33. Mimeographed.
64. ——— Tabulation of Answers to Questionnaire on Methods of Cataloging Instruction . . . 1923. Mimeographed.
65. Association of American Library Schools. Committee on Field Work. Report. A.A.L.S. Proceedings, 1925. Appendix. p. 63-78. Mimeographed.
66. Association of American Library Schools. Committee on Standardization of Credits. Report. A.A.L.S. Proceedings, 1924. p. 4-14. Mimeographed.
67. Association of American Library Schools. Committee on the Teaching of Book Selection. . . . Report. A.A.L.S. Proceedings, 1925. p. 8-34. Mimeographed.
68. Association of American Medical Colleges. Commission on Medical Education. Final report, 1932.
69. Bartlett, L. W., and Neel, M. B. Compensation in the Professions, 1933. p. xiii.
70. Bay, J. C. Sciences in the Training of the Librarian, 1928.
71. Bingham, W. V., and Freyd, Max. Procedures in Employment Psychology, 1926. Ch. i.
72. Bird, Charles. Effective Study Habits, c1931.
73. Bishop, W. W. American College Library and Its Librarian. In Claremont Colleges. Dedication of Harper Hall, 1932. p. 18-33.
74. ——— Library in the American College. A.L.A. College and Reference Library Yearbook, No. 1, 1929. p. 1-12.
75. ——— Status of Library Schools in Universities. Association of American Universities. Journal of 35th Annual Conference, 1933. p. 124-37.
76. Bliss, H. E. As to a Philosophy of Librarianship. Lib. Quart., V: 232-35.
77. Bode, B. H. Modern Educational Theories, 1927. Chs. iv-v.
78. Book, W. F. Learning How to Study and Work Effectively, 1926.
79. Bossard, J. H. S., and Dewhurst, J. F. University Education for Business, 1931.

80. Bossard, J. H. S., and Dewhurst, J. F. *University Education for Business*, 1931. p. 511-17.
81. Bostwick, A. E. [Remarks on Report of A.L.A. Committee on Library Training] *Lib. Jour.*, XXVII: C136-39.
82. Bosworth, F. H., and Jones, R. C. *Study of Architectural Schools*, 1932.
83. Boyd, A. M. *United States Government Publications*, 1931.
84. Bragdon, H. D. *Counselling the College Student*, 1929.
85. Brigham, H. F. *Training Class Is Passing*. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVII: 23-26.
86. Brown, W. A., May, M. A., and others. *Education of American Ministers*, 1934.
87. Brownlow, Louis, Gallagher, M. F., and Milam, C. H. *Library and Local Government*. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVII: 117-22.
88. Burton, W. H. *Nature and Direction of Learning*, 1929. p. 20-21.
89. Buswell, G. T. *Research and the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education*. *Journal of Educational Research*, XXIII: 146-52.
90. Butler, Pierce. *Introduction to Library Science*, 1933.
91. California Library Association. *Certification Committee. Professional versus Non-professional Positions in Libraries*, 1931(?). Mimeographed.
92. California State Library School. *Circular of Information*, 1915-16.
93. ——— Same, 1918-21.
94. Carnegie Library of Atlanta. *Library School. Circular of Information*, 1924-25.
95. ——— Same, 1926-27.
96. Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. *Training School for Children's Librarians*, 1901-2.
97. ——— *Circular of Information*, 1911-12.
98. ——— Same, 1912-13.
99. Carnegie Institute. *Carnegie Library School. Catalog*, 1917-18.
100. ——— Same, 1918-19.
101. Carnegie Institute of Technology. *Bulletin*, Jan. 1, 1933. (Carnegie Library School, 1933-34.)

102. Charters, W. W. College Preparation for Reference Work. Sch. and Soc., XXVII: 150-52.
103. ——— Job Analysis in Education for Librarianship. Libraries, XXXII: 7-10.
104. Clark, J. W. Care of Books, 1901.
105. Coffman, L. D. Civilization through Service. In The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order. Addresses at a Conference . . . in New York. Nov. 15-17, 1932. 1933. p. 25-38.
106. Columbia College. Library. Annual Report, 1884. p. 37-40.
107. Columbia College. Library [and] School of Library Economy. Annual Report, 1887.
108. ——— Same, 1888.
109. ——— Circular of Information, 1884.
110. ——— Same, 1886-87.
111. ——— Same, 1887-88.
112. ——— Same, 1888-89.
113. Columbia College School of Library Economy from a Student's Standpoint. Lib. Jour., XII: 363-64.
114. Columbia Library School. Lib. Jour., XIII: 17.
115. ——— Lib. Jour., XIII: 96-97.
116. Columbia University. Home Study Courses in Library Service, 1928-29.
117. ——— Report . . . , 1933. p. 30-31.
118. Columbia University. School of Library Service. Announcement, 1927-28.
119. ——— Same, 1933-34.
120. ——— Same, 1934-35.
121. ——— Preliminary Announcement, 1926-27.
122. ——— Report, 1928.
123. ——— Same, 1929.
124. ——— Same, 1930.
125. ——— Same, 1931.
126. ——— Same, 1932.
127. Columbia University. School of Medicine. Announcement, 1932-33. p. 84.
128. ——— Report, 1933. p. 7.
129. Columbia University. Teachers College. Report . . . 1927. p. 6-22.

130. Columbia University. Teachers College. New College. Announcement, 1932-33. p. 14.
131. Committee on the Grading of Nursing Schools. Nursing Schools Today and Tomorrow, 1934.
132. Cotton des Houssayes, J. B. Duties and Qualifications of a Librarian . . . 1906.
133. Course in Library Science at the University of Michigan. Lib. Jour., LI: 477.
134. Cowley, W. H. Personnel Bibliographical Index, 1932.
135. Crawford, C. C. Technique of Study, 1928.
136. Cubberley, E. P., and Eells, W. C. Introduction to the Study of Education, c1933. Ch. xii.
137. Curtis, F. R. Round Table of Library School Instructors. Lib. Jour., XL: 136-37.
138. Daniels, J. F. People: a Modern Emphasis in Library Training. Lib. Jour., XXXIII: 173-76.
139. Danton, J. P. Plea for a Philosophy of Librarianship. Lib. Quart., IV: 527-51.
140. Dean, Hazel. Prediction of Success in Library School, 1931. (Masters' essay, Syracuse University.) Typewritten.
141. Dewey, Melvil. Civil Service Examinations for New York State Library. Lib. Jour., XIV: 118-21.
142. ——— [Remarks on Paper by H. E. Green] Lib. Jour., XV: C115.
143. ——— School of Library Economy. Lib. Jour., VIII: 285-91.
144. ——— School of Library Economy at Columbia College. Lib. Jour., IX: 117-20.
145. [Discussion of School of Library Economy] Lib. Jour., VIII: 288-91.
146. Doherty, R. E. Engineering Preparation for Creative Technical Engineering Leadership. Journal of Engineering Education, n.s., XXIII: 309-21.
147. ——— School of Engineering. Yale Alumni Weekly. XLII: 477-79.
148. Donnelly, J. R. Best Time for Practice Work. Libraries, XXXI: 12-13.
149. ——— Library School and the Library. Lib. Jour., XXXV: 109-11.

150. Doyle, I. M. Library School Marks and Success in Library Service, 1931. (Master's essay, University of Illinois.) Typewritten.
151. Drexel Institute. Library Class, 1892(?).
152. ——— Same, 1894-95.
153. Drexel Institute Library School. Lib. Jour., XXIV: 222.
154. Drexel Institute. Library School, 1898-99.
155. ——— Same, 1899-1900.
156. ——— Same, 1901-2.
157. ——— Same, 1913-14.
158. Drexel Institute. . . . Record of Library Training Classes. Lib. Jour., XIX: 307-8.
159. Drexel Institute. School of Library Science. Circular of Information, 1923-24.
160. Drexel Institute. Summer School of Library Science for School Librarians. Announcement, 1926.
161. Drexel Library Class. Lib. Jour., XVII: 488.
162. Drury, F. K. W. Book Selection, 1930.
163. ——— Order Work for Libraries, 1930.
164. Dudgeon, M. S. What Has an Employer the Right to Expect from Library School Graduates? A.L.A. Professional Training Section. Proceedings, 1924. p. 5-7. Mimeographed.
165. Dury, John. Reformed Library-Keeper, 1906.
166. Eastman, L. A. Meeting of Library School Instructors. Lib. Jour., XXXVI: 69-70.
167. ——— President's Address [at 51st Annual Conference of American Library Association], A.L.A. Bull., XXIII: 231-36.
168. Elliott, J. E. Education for Business Librarianship. Lib. Jour., LI: 125-27.
169. ——— Library Conditions which Confront Library Schools. A.L.A. Bull., III: 427-36.
170. Emory University. Library School. Circular of Information, 1932-33.
171. Evans, H. R. Library Instruction in Universities, Colleges and Normal Schools. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1914. No. 34.
172. Evans, Silas. Contribution of the Library to Effective Teaching. A.L.A. College and Reference Library Yearbook, No. 2, 1930. p. 1-7.

173. Fargo, L. F. Library in the School, 1933. p. 53-55.
174. ——— Preparation for School Library Work, 1936.
175. ——— Teachers College in Relation to the Training of School Librarians. Peabody Journal of Education. X: 45-52.
176. Fay, L. E. Instruction in Agricultural College Library Work in Land-grant Colleges. A.L.A. Bull., XXII: 388-90.
177. Flexner, Abraham. Is Social Work a Profession? 1915.
178. ——— Medical Education, 1925.
179. ——— Same. p. 146-48.
180. ——— Medical Education in the United States and Canada, 1910.
181. ——— Universities, American, English and German, 1930.
182. Forbes, S. A., and others. Methods of Discovering the Exceptional Teacher. Sch. and Soc., VII: 382-87.
183. Ford, G. S. Professional Education at the Graduate Level. Association of American Universities. Journal of . . . 32d Annual Conference. 1930. p. 101-11.
184. Frazier, R. H. Development of Rigorous Thinking. Tech Engineering News, XIII: 105, 120.
185. ——— Experiment in the Honors Treatment of Students in Electrical Engineering. Sch. and Soc., XXXIX: 271-72.
186. Friedel, J. H. Training for Librarianship, Lib. Jour., XLIV: 569-74.
187. Gates, A. I. Psychology for Students of Education, 1932. Chs. ix-xii.
188. George Peabody College for Teachers. Announcement, 1933-34.
189. Getchell, M. W. The A.L.A. and Training for Librarianship. Lib. Jour., LI: 611-12, 770-74.
190. Gies, W. J. Dental Education in the United States and Canada, 1926.
191. ——— Same. p. 101-14.
192. Good, C. V. Teaching in College and University, 1929. Ch. vii.
193. Green, H. E. Library Experts—Their Rights and Duties. Lib. Jour., XV: C15-19.
194. Hadley, Chalmers. What Library Schools Can Do for the Profession. A.L.A. Bull., VI: 147-51.

195. Hagerty, J. E. Training of Social Workers, 1931.
196. ——— Same. Ch. xiv.
197. ——— Same. p. 92-93.
198. ——— Same. p. 149-61.
199. Harvard University. Graduate School of Business Administration, 1932.
200. Harvard University. Medical School, 1933-34.
201. Headley, L. A. How to Study in College, c1926.
202. Henry, W. E. System of Library Schools. Lib. Jour., L: 347-49.
203. Hopkins, L. B. Personnel Procedure in Education. Educational Record, Supplement, Oct., 1926.
204. Horton, Marion. Recent Developments in Correspondence Study. Lib. Jour., LIV: 1022-23.
205. Howe, H. E. Library School and the Special Librarian. Special Libraries, XXIV: 107-11.
206. ——— Library School Curriculum. Lib. Quart., I: 283-90.
207. ——— Summer Library School as a Factor in Professional Education. Lib. Jour., XLV: 583-87.
208. Hull, C. L. Aptitude Testing, c1928.
209. Institute for Government Research. Bureau of Public Personnel Administration. Proposed Classification and Compensation Plans for Library Positions, 1927.
210. ——— Same. p. 28-38.
211. Instruction in Professional Ethics: Current Practices in the Schools of Eight Professions. N.E.A. Research Bulletin, IX: 10-23.
212. Iowa State College. Library. Summary of Reports. July 1, 1923-June 30, 1933, with an Outline of Possible Lines of Development, 1933-53. 1933.
213. Jackson, D. C. Function of Research in Engineering Education. Science, n.s., LXXIV: 183-87.
214. Joeckel, C. B. Government of the American Public Library, c1935.
215. Johns Hopkins University Circular. Catalogue . . . for 1933-34 of the School of Medicine.
216. Johnson, B. L. Stephens College Library Experiment. A.L.A. Bull., XXVII: 205-11.

217. Johnson, E. R. Aims and Purposes of Collegiate Schools of Business . . . *Journal of Business of the University of Chicago*, V: 17-28.
218. Johnston, W. D. Need of Specialization in Library Service. *American Library Institute Papers*, 1913. p. 10-18.
219. Josephson, A. G. S. Post-graduate School of Bibliography. *Lib. Jour.*, XXVI: C197-99.
220. ——— Preparation for Librarianship. *Lib. Jour.*, XXV: 226-28.
221. Judd, C. H. Nature of the General Professional Training Needed [in the Training of College Teachers] In Gray, W. S., ed. *Training of College Teachers*, c1930. p. 91-102.
222. Kent, R. A. *Higher Education in America*, c1930. Chs. iii-vii, ix-x.
223. Keogh, Andrew. Advanced Library Training for Research Workers. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XIII: 165-67.
224. Kitson, H. D. Interneship for Vocational Counsellors. *Teachers College Record*, XXX: 703-8.
225. Kroeger, A. B. Drexel Institute Library School. *Lib. Jour.*, XXIII: C62-63.
226. ——— Evolution of the Curriculum of the Drexel Institute Library School. *A.L.A. Bull.*, II: 210-13.
227. League of Library Commissions. Summer Library Schools. *Lib. Jour.*, XLII: 120-21.
228. Learned, W. S. *American Public Library and the Diffusion of Knowledge*, 1924.
229. Learned, W. S., and others. *Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools*, 1920.
230. Leonard, R. J. Trends in Professional Education. *Teachers College Record*, XXVI: 177-83.
231. Lewis, E. E. *Personnel Problems of the Teaching Staff*, 1926. Ch. xii.
232. Library Class of New York Free Circulating Library. *Lib. Jour.*, XX: 247.
233. Library School. *Lib. Jour.*, XIV: 479.
234. Library School. *Lib. Jour.*, XV: 23-25.
235. Library Schools and Training Classes of the United States. *Lib. Jour.*, XIX: 296-308.

236. Lichtenstein, Walter. Library Education. *Lib. Quart.*, IV: 270-73.
237. ——— Question of a Graduate Library School. *Lib. Jour.*, XLIII: 233-35.
238. Los Angeles Public Library. Library School. Circular of Information, 1917-18.
239. ——— Same, 1925-26.
240. ——— Same, 1931-32.
241. Los Angeles Public Library. Library Training School. Circular of Information, 1915-16. p. 15.
242. ——— Training Class. *Lib. Jour.*, XVII: 234-36.
243. Louisiana State University. School of Library Science. Announcement, 1931-32.
244. ——— Same, 1932-33.
245. ——— Same, 1933-34.
246. Macadam, Elizabeth. Equipment of the Social Worker, 1925. p. 66-71.
247. McCracken, J. H., ed. American Universities and Colleges, 1932. Ch. v.
248. McCrea, R. C. Is Business a Profession? *Columbia University Quarterly*, XXIV: 27-34.
249. McGill University. Library School. Announcement, 1928-29.
250. ——— Revised Course of Study, 1930-31.
251. McMurray, F. M. Biggest Thing in Teaching. *Teachers College Record*, XXVIII: 215-19.
252. Manley, M. C. Library Workers Association. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XV: 231-32.
253. Mann, C. R. Study of Engineering Education, 1918.
254. ——— Same. p. 57-59.
255. Mann, Margaret. Introduction to Cataloging and the Classification of Books, 1930.
256. Marshall, L. C. Collegiate School of Business, c1928.
257. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Catalogue, April, 1932.
258. Mayo, W. J. Medical Education for the General Practitioner. Annual Congress on Medical Education . . . 1927. p. 18-20.
259. Mays, A. B. Introduction to Vocational Education, c1930. Ch. xv.

260. Measuring Abstract Intelligence in Personnel Work. Public Personnel Studies, VII: 69-92.
261. Messenger, J. F. Educating Efficient Underlings. Sch. and Soc., XXVIII: 335-36.
262. Morrison, H. C. Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School. c1931. p. 91-100.
263. National Education Association. Department of Superintendence. Seventh Yearbook (Articulation of the Units of American Education), 1929. Ch. xxii.
264. National Plan for Libraries. A.L.A. Bull., XXIX: 91-98.
265. National Society of College Teachers of Education. Yearbook, No. 17. (Current Educational Readjustments in Higher Institutions), 1929(?). Ch. iv.
266. New Jersey College for Women. Announcement, 1929-30.
267. ——— Same, 1935-36.
268. New York Public Library. Library School. Annual Report, 1913.
269. ——— Circular of Information, 1911-12.
270. ——— Same, 1925-26.
271. New York School of Social Work. General Announcement, 1932-33.
272. ——— Same, 1933-34.
273. New York State College for Teachers. Annual Catalogue, 1932-33.
274. ——— Same, 1933-34.
275. New York State Library. Bulletin. Library School. No. 1, 1891. (Handbook, 1891-92.)
276. ——— Same, No. 9, 1901. (Handbook of New York State Library School, [1901].)
277. ——— Same, No. 15, 1903. (Handbook of New York State Library School, [1903].)
278. New York State Library. Bulletin. Library School. No. 6, 1899. (. . . Annual Report of Library School, 1899.)
279. ——— Same, No. 8, 1901. (. . . Annual report of New York State Library School, 1900.)
280. ——— Same, No. 14, 1903. (. . . Annual report of New York State Library School, 1902.)
281. ——— Same, No. 51, 1924. (. . . Annual report of the New York State Library School, 1923.)

282. New York State Library School. Circular of Information, 1909-10.
283. ——— Same, 1911-12.
284. ——— Same, 1913-14.
285. ——— Courses and Expenses. *Lib. Jour.*, XVIII: 477-79.
286. ——— First Quarter Century of the New York State Library School. 1912. p. 10.
287. ——— Handbook 7, 1897.
288. ——— Same, 14, 1899.
289. New York University. College of Engineering. Announcements, 1932-33.
290. Noé, A. C. University Library and Research. *Lib. Quart.*, IV: 300-5.
291. North Carolina College for Women. Catalogue, 1928-29.
292. ——— Same, 1930-31.
293. Note on Pratt Institute Free Library. *Lib. Jour.*, XVIII: 296.
294. Ohio State University. School of Social Administration, 1932-33.
295. Ohman, O. A. Study of the Causes of Scholastic Deficiencies in Engineering by the Individual Case Method. University of Iowa Studies in Education, Vol. 3, No. 7, 1927.
296. Olcott, F. J. Training of a Children's Librarian. *A.L.A. Bull.*, II: 213-16.
297. Park, C. W. Co-operative System of Education. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1916. No. 37.
298. Paterson, D. G. Program for Student Counselling. In Hudelson, Earl, ed. Problems of College Education. 1928. Ch. xxii.
299. Plummer, M. W. Brooklyn Library Training Class. *Lib. Jour.*, XVI: C87.
300. ——— Evolution of the Library School Curriculum. *A.L.A. Bull.*, II: 203-5.
301. ——— Evolution of the Pratt Institute Library School Curriculum. *A.L.A. Bull.*, II: 206-10.
302. ——— Forecast of the Next Twenty-Five Years for Library Schools. *Lib. Jour.*, XXXV: 251-53.
303. ——— Pratt Institute Library School. *Lib. Jour.*, XXIII: C60-62.
304. ——— Specialization and Grading in Library Schools. *A.L.A. Bull.*, VII: 343-47.

305. Plummer, M. W. Training for Librarianship. Lib. Jour., XXVI: 317-23.
306. ——— Training for Librarianship. Revised by F. K. Walter. 1923.
307. Pratt Institute Free Library. Lib. Jour., 18: 296.
308. Pratt Institute Free Library. Training Classes, 1893(?).
309. Pratt Institute. Free Public Library and Library School. Lib. Jour., XVII: 239-40.
310. Pratt Institute Library School. Lib. Jour., XXI: 330-31.
311. Pratt Institute Library School. Lib. Jour., XXIV: 165-66.
312. Pratt Institute Library School. Lib. Jour., XXV: 184-85.
313. Pratt Institute. School of Library Training, 1896-97.
314. ——— Same, 1898-99.
315. ——— Same, 1899-1900.
316. ——— Same, 1901-2.
317. Pratt Institute. School of Library Training. Circular of Information, 1904-5.
318. ——— Same, 1905-6.
319. Pratt Institute. School of Library Science. Circular of Information, 1912-13.
320. ——— Same, 1913-14.
321. ——— Same, 1921-22.
322. ——— Same, 1933-34.
323. Rappleye, W. C. Objectives of Medical Education. Columbia University Quarterly, XXIII: 437-45.
324. Rathbone, J. A. Association of American Library Schools. Lib. Jour., XL: 302-3.
325. ——— Pratt Institute School of Library Science. Lib. Jour., XLVI: 935-36.
326. ——— Projected Normal Course at Pratt Institute School of Library Science. A.L.A. Bull., VI: 297-300.
327. ——— Statement Regarding Curriculum of Library Schools. A.L.A. Bull., VI: 155.
328. ——— Training of Assistants for Lending Department Work. A.L.A. Bull., XIII: 173-75.
329. ——— What College Librarians Can Do for Library Schools. A.L.A. Bull., VII: 319-20.
330. Redlich, Joseph. Common Law and the Case Method, 1914.

- 331. Reece, E. J. Recruiting for Library Service. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVII: 185-89.
- 332. ——— Service Loads of Library School Faculties. *Lib. Quart.*, I: 37-56.
- 333. ——— Some Possible Developments in Library Education, 1924.
- 334. Reed, A. Z. Learned Professions and Their Organization. In *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. . . . Annual Report, 1933*. p. 63-89.
- 335. ——— Present-Day Law Schools in the United States and Canada, 1928. p. 209-21.
- 336. ——— Review of Legal Education in the United States and Canada, 1929.
- 337. ——— Training for the Public Profession of the Law, 1921.
- 338. Reeves, F. W., and Russell, J. D. Relation of the College Library to Recent Movements in Higher Education. *Lib. Quart.*, I: 57-66.
- 339. [Review of] Drury, F. K. W. Order Work for Libraries. *Library Association Record*, third series, I: 72. (Feb., 1931).
- 340. Robbins, M. E. Training Teacher-Librarians in Normal Schools. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XIII: 279-81.
- 341. Roe, J. W. Co-operative Plan of Engineering Education. *Management Engineering*, II: 269-74.
- 342. Rogers, J. C. Standardization Movement in American Law Schools. *Educational Record*, XIII: 219-27.
- 343. Rose, Ernestine. Vital Distinctions of a Library Apprentice Course. *A.L.A. Bull.*, X: 189-94.
- 344. Russell, J. E. Trend in American Education, c1922. Ch. xiv.
- 345. Russell, W. F. Educational Developments and the School Library. *A.L.A. School Library Yearbook No. 2, 1928*. p. 49-53.
- 346. ——— Next Thirty Years—the Professional Fields. *University of Iowa Studies No. 33*. p. 142-46. (Jan. 1, 1931.)
- 347. [St. Louis Library School] *Lib. Jour.*, LVII: 628.
- 348. St. Louis Library School. Circular of Information, 1923-24.
- 349. ——— Same, 1926-27.
- 350. School of Library Economy. *Lib. Jour.*, XII: 78-80.
- 351. School of Library Economy. *Lib. Jour.*, XII: 167-69.

- 352. School of Library Economy. In Sawyer, H. P., comp., *Library as a Vocation*, 1933. p. 25-29.
- 353. Seattle and Montclair Surveys. *Lib. Jour.*, LV: 422-23.
- 354. Sharp, K. L. Department of Library Science of Armour Institute. *Lib. Jour.*, XIX: 162-66.
- 355. ——— *Instruction in Library Economy through University Extension Methods*. *Lib. Jour.*, XXIII: C75-78.
- 356. ——— *University of Illinois State Library School*. *Lib. Jour.*, XXIII: C63-66.
- 357. Shaw, C. B. *Advanced Training for College and University Librarianship*. *Lib. Jour.*, LII: 21-24.
- 358. Shera, J. H. *Recent Social Trends and Future Library Policy*. *Lib. Quart.*, III: 339-53.
- 359. Sherman, C. E. *Training Class Is Not Passing*. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVII: 26-31.
- 360. Simmons College. *Announcement of Courses*, 1902-3.
- 361. ——— *Annual Catalogue*, 1903-4.
- 362. ——— *Same*, 1904-5.
- 363. ——— *Same*, 1906-7.
- 364. ——— *Same*, 1909-10.
- 365. ——— *Same*, 1912-13.
- 366. ——— *Same*, 1915-16.
- 367. ——— *Same*, 1918-19.
- 368. Sisler, D. J., and Coulter, E. M. *Suggested Programs for the Second, Third and Fourth Years of a Graduate Library School*. *Libraries*, XXXI: 164-66.
- 369. *Sketches of Four Library Schools*. *Lib. Jour.*, XXVIII: C98-101.
- 370. Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education. *Report of the Investigation of Engineering Education, 1923-29. 1930; Bulletin of the Investigation of Engineering Education, 1926-*.
- 371. ——— *Study of the Co-operative Method of Engineering Education, 1927*. Bulletin No. 12 of the Investigation of Engineering Education, May, 1927.
- 372. Special Libraries Association. *Committee on Training, 1926. Training for the Special Librarian*. *Special Libraries*, XVII: 329-30.
- 373. State College of Washington. *Monthly Bulletin*, June, 1933.

374. Steffens, Lincoln. *Autobiography*, c1931. p. 644-47.
375. Stevenson, J. A. *Project Method of Teaching*, 1921. p. 43.
376. Stone, C. H. *Difficulties Encountered by Trained School Librarians as a Basis for the Revision of the Professional Curriculum*. *Lib. Quart.*, III: 66-86.
377. Strohm, Adam. *Intellectual Freedom and Integrity*. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXV: 415-19.
378. *Summer Library Schools*. *Public Libraries*, XI: 131-34.
379. *Syracuse University. Bulletin*, April, 1909. (*Library School*.)
380. ——— Same, April, 1913. (*Library School*.)
381. ——— Same. (*School of Library Science*, 1933-34.)
382. ——— *Library Economy*, [1903-4] (?), [1904-5] (?).
383. *Syracuse University Library School. Lib. Jour.*, XXXIII: 522.
384. Tolman, F. L. *Popular Government, Social Welfare and Libraries*. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XXVII: 5-10.
385. *Training Classes in Libraries*. *Public Libraries*, XI: 134-36.
386. Tufts, J. H. *Education and Training for Social Work*, 1923.
387. ——— Same, p. 91.
388. ——— Same, p. 115-16.
389. Tyler, A. S. *Statement Regarding New Course at Western Reserve University Library School*. *A.L.A. Bull.*, VIII: 243-44.
390. *Union Theological Seminary. Announcement*, 1932-33.
391. *University of California. Library. Courses in Library Practice*, 1921-22.
392. *University of California. Department of Library Science. Announcement for 1924-25*.
393. *University of California. School of Librarianship. Announcement for 1928-29*.
394. ——— Same, 1933-34.
395. *University of Chicago. Announcements*, July 10, 1933. p. 119.
396. *University of Chicago. Graduate Library School. Announcements*, 1928-29.
397. ——— Same, 1933-34.
398. ——— Same, 1934-35. p. 3, 11.
399. *University of Cincinnati. College of Engineering and Commerce. Announcement of Courses*, 1932-33.
400. ——— *Co-operative Courses. Announcement . . . 1933-34*.

401. University of Denver. School of Librarianship. Announcement, 1932-33.
402. ——— Same, 1933-34.
403. University of Illinois. Annual Register, 1919-20. p. 350-52.
404. ——— Same, 1926-27. p. 169.
405. ——— Catalogue, 1897-98. p. 203-5.
406. University of Illinois [Library School.] Libraries, XXXI: 545-46.
407. University of Illinois. State Library School. Circular of Information, 1897-98.
408. ——— Same, 1898.
409. ——— Same, 1900-1901.
410. ——— Same, 1910-11.
411. ——— Report and Student Record, 1893-1903.
412. University of Michigan Courses in Library Science. Lib. Jour., LI: 565-66.
413. University of Michigan. Courses in Library Science, 1926-27.
414. ——— Same, 1931-32.
415. ——— Same, 1933-34.
416. ——— Same, Summer Session, 1927.
417. University of Montana Bulletin. Catalogue Number, 1932-33. p. 77-78.
418. University of North Carolina. Record, July, 1931.
419. University of Toronto. Library School. Calendar, 1932-33.
420. ——— Same, 1935-36.
421. University of Washington. Catalogue, 1912-13. p. 136.
422. University of Washington. Library School. 1932-33.
423. University of Washington. Department of Librarianship, 1933-34.
424. Van Hoesen, H. B. More Thoughts on Training for Librarianship. Lib. Jour., L: 360-61.
425. Walker, S. H. Social Work and the Training of Social Workers, 1928.
426. Walter, F. K. Course of Training for Hospital Librarians. Lib. Jour., XLIX: 381.
427. ——— [Statement Regarding Curriculum of Library Schools,] A.L.A. Bull., VI: 156-58.
428. ——— War and Library Training. A.L.A. Bull., XII: 98-103.

429. Wang, C. K. A. Selecting Applicants to a Library School or Training Class: an Approach to a Technique. *Lib. Quart.*, III: 253-66.
430. Weigle, L. A. Who and What Determine the Educational Policies of the Theological Schools? *Educational Record*, XIII: 201-11.
431. Weld, L. D. College Teacher and Research. *Science*, n.s., LII: 45-48.
432. Werner, O. H. Every College Student's Problems, 1929.
433. Western Reserve University. Library School. Catalogue, 1904-5.
434. ——— Same, 1907-8.
435. ——— Same, 1908-9.
436. ——— Same, 1912-13.
437. ——— Same, 1915-16.
438. Western Reserve University. School of Library Science. Annual Catalogue, 1925-26.
439. ——— Requirements and Courses, 1933-34.
440. ——— Same, 1934-35.
441. Wheeler, J. L. What Has an Employer the Right to Expect from Library School Graduates? A.L.A. Professional Training Section. Proceedings, 1924. p. 7-9. Mimeographed.
442. Whitehead, A. N. Universities and Their Function. *Atlantic Monthly*, CXLI: 638-44.
443. Wilbur, R. L. Control of Medical Education. *Educational Record*, XIII: 212-18.
444. Williamson, C. C. Place of Research in Library Service. *Lib. Quart.*, I: 1-17.
445. ——— Training for Library Service, 1923.
446. ——— Same, Ch. i.
447. ——— Same, Ch. ii.
448. ——— Same, Ch. vii.
449. Wilson, L. B. Possibility of Linking the Professional Education in Law, Medicine and the Engineering Sciences to the General Educational Program of the Graduate School. Association of American Universities. Journal . . . of 33d Annual Conference. 1931. p. 93-97.
450. Wilson, L. R. Development of Research in Relation to Library Schools. *Lib. Jour.*, LVIII: 817-21.

- 451. Wilson, L. R. Service of Libraries in Promoting Scholarship and Research. *Lib. Quart.*, III: 127-45.
- 452. Windsor, P. L. Association of American Library Schools. *A.L.A. Bull.*, XI: 160-62. Also in Sawyer, H. P. *Library as a Vocation*. 1933. p. 447-50.
- 453. Wisconsin Library School. *Lib. Jour.*, XXXI: 134-35.
- 454. Wisconsin Library School. *Catalogue*, 1907-8.
- 455. ——— Same, 1911-12.
- 456. ——— Same, 1920-21.
- 457. ——— Same, 1930-31.
- 458. ——— Same, 1932-33.
- 459. Works, G. A. Research and the Graduate Library Schools. *Libraries*, XXXIII: 100-3.
- 460. Yale University. Divinity School. [Announcement] . . . 1933-34.
- 461. ——— Report, 1930-31.
- 462. Yale University. School of Law. [Announcement] . . . 1932-33.

*

INDEX

*

- Accrediting of students, 88, 144-45, 169-70
- Acquisition methods, 62-63, 67
- Administration of libraries, 64-66, 67, 85, 106; new emphasis suggested, 93; *see also* Organization of libraries
- Admission requirements, 138-41, 145-46, 182-86; determine curriculum level, 140-43; deviations, 146, 185-86; *see also* Selection of students
- Akers, S. G., cited, 91
- American Library Association: committees concerned with library schools, 28, 41-42, 43, 45; professional training section, 42; Temporary Library Training Board, 42, 44; Board of Education for Librarianship, 42-43, 44-45, 78, 85, 114, 140-41, 145, 148
- American Library Association Survey, cited, 23
- Apprentice classes, 39, 55-56
- Apprenticing, 170-71; *see also* Field work
- Armour Institute, Department of Library Science: founded, 29; curriculum, 31, 32; liberal studies, 33, 36; length of term, 37, 102; children's literature, 49; course descriptions, 55; admission requirements, 138, 139
- Association of American Library Schools, 46-47, 114
- Attitudes, developing of, 159-62
- Bentley, Richard, 2
- Bibliography: trade and national, 62; additional topics suggested, 67; ambiguity of term, 85; new emphasis possible, 93
- Board of Education for Librarianship: creation and scope, 42-43; Library Curriculum Study, 18, 23, 44-45; cited, 78, 114; effort for uniform terminology, 85; classification of schools, 140-41, 145; recommends schools' connection with universities, 148
- Book selection: evolution of courses, 48-49; subject of instruction, 62, 104-5; ambiguity of term, 85
- Boyd, A. M., cited, 91
- Bradshaw, Henry, 5
- Bureau of Public Personnel Administration, cited, 18, 23
- California, University of, School of Librarianship: consolidation of subjects, 86; specialized program, 103; admission requirements, 139
- California Library Association, Certification Committee, schedule, 16-17
- California State Library School, local interests, 54
- Carnegie Corporation, survey of library schools, 44
- Carnegie Library of Atlanta, Library School, grouping of courses, 84
- Carnegie Library School, Pittsburgh: business methods taught, 52; relation between libraries and schools, 53; founded, 96; training for school librarians, 97; study of home libraries, 97; admission requirements, 139
- Cataloguing: language study as aid, 35; subject of instruction, 63; new emphasis suggested, 93; differences in needs, 96; future needs, 165
- Certification of librarians, 16
- Chicago, University of, extension methods in library study, 57
- Chicago, University of, Graduate Library School: programs for advanced degrees, 103; service studies, 177
- Children's librarians: duties, 9-10; courses for, 96-97, 102
- Children's literature: beginning of study, 49; varying needs, 95-96
- Cincinnati, University of, College of Engineering and Commerce, Department of Co-ordination, 87
- Class presentation, 123, 124
- Classification of books: in the curriculum, 63; changed conditions affecting, 165
- Classification of library schools, 140-41, 145

- Clément, Nicolas, 3
- Codification of library practice, suggested measure, 17-18
- College libraries: early collections, 4; duties of librarians, 7-8; studies relating to, 106
- College of St. Catherine, Library School, concurrent scheduling of courses, 87
- College programs of library study, 57
- Columbia College, School of Library Economy: founded, 29, 30; Dewey's statement of aim, 31, 32; course largely technical, 32-33; curriculum, 33-34, 35, 36, 49, 52, 79; length of term, 37; book-selection course, 48; "reading and aids," 53; course descriptions, 55; curriculum extension, 102; admission requirements, 138, 139
- Columbia University, College of Engineering, accrediting of students, 88
- Columbia University, School of Journalism, accrediting of students, 88
- Columbia University, School of Library Service: returned to Columbia, 29; correspondence courses, 57; accrediting of students, 88; elective scheme, 100; programs for advanced degrees, 103; student guidance, 134-35; surveys of libraries, 177
- Columbia University, School of Medicine, lectures on medical ethics, 161
- "Consulting librarians," 53
- Copyright law, place in curriculum, 67
- Correspondence study, projected by New York State Library School, 40; offerings, 57; *see also* Non-resident study
- Cotton des Houssayes, J. B., 3
- Curriculum: purpose, 1; beginnings, 28-40; aims of early schools, 29-30, 32; principles, 31-33; specific features, 33-36; length, 37-38, 54-55, 77, 102; organization, 38-39, 55, 76-77; growth, 41-58; influence of boards and committees, 41-43; influence of alumni and students, 43-44, 45-46; influenced by systematic inspection, 44-45; influenced by faculties, 46-47; influenced by tradition, 47; reaction from emphasis on methods, 48-50; in later schools, 50-53; additional matter, 53-54; criticism, 58; outlines, 59-71; subjects of instruction, 62-66; liberal and peripheral studies, 68-71, 108; adapting, 72-94; choice of field to be served, 72-73; level of work contemplated, 73; functional or systematic organization, 74-75, 80, 89-90; logical vs. psychological arrangement, 74-75; content, 75-76; internal proportioning, 78; interrelating of elements, 79; classifying matter, 79-82; formation of courses, 82-83; grouping of material, 83-85, 93; coordination of courses, 85-89; uniformity, 90; investigation as basis, 91-92; adaptation to conditions of library work, 92, 137-38, 143, 164-66, 181; variations, 95-101; pointed to specific kinds of library work, 96-98; electives, 98-101; extensions, 101-13; history of extensions, 102-3; study appropriate to extensions 104-7; research as an element, 109; objections to extensions, 110-11; reasons for amplifying, 111-12; effect of extensions on schools, 112-13; abridgments, 114-16; other proposals for modifying, 116-20; supplements, 121-36; work contacts bearing on, 123-25; field work, 125-30; student guidance, 130-36; age level and academic plane, 137-54; place appropriate to matter, 142-43; choice of level, 145; affiliations, 146-54; in perspective, 155-72; desired comprehensiveness, 162-63; refinement of form, 163; conditions, 173-87; standards and procedures, 173-80; student body, 181-86
- Degrees, 102, 103; *see also* Accrediting of students
- Denver, University of, School of Librarianship: consolidation of courses, 86-87; elective scheme, 99; admission requirement, 140
- Dewey, Melvil, 5; plans first library school, 30; quoted, 31
- Doctorate, programs for, 103
- Donnelly, J. R., cited, 165
- Drexel Institute, School of Library Science: founded, 29; suspension, 29, 139; curriculum, 31, 32, 50; early aims, 32; liberal studies, 33; length of term, 37; revival, 46; book selection,

- 49; children's literature, 49; changed emphasis, 49; course descriptions, 55; admission requirements, 138, 139
- Dury, John, 3
- Economy, need in library work, 15-16
- Education vs. training, 155-59
- Edwards, Edward, 5
- Electives, 98-101
- Emory University, Library School (formerly Library School of Carnegie Library of Atlanta), 84; consolidation of courses, 86-87
- Employment service, 170
- Entrance requirements, *see* Admission requirements
- Extension methods of teaching, 57; *see also* Correspondence study
- Fargo, L. F.: cited, 16, 97, 99; committee to investigate library school curriculum in teachers' colleges, 154
- Field work, 124; value, 122-23; criticism, 125-26, 127-29; in various professions, 126-27; in library schools, 127-30, 170-71
- Films as library material, 14
- Flexner, Abraham, cited, 149
- Gaylord Brothers, correspondence courses, 57
- Glasgow, University of, Faculty of Law, student guidance, 135
- Graded schemes of service, 16-17
- Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration: co-ordination of courses, 152; course in business ethics, 161-62; fluidity of curriculum, 164; selection of teachers, 175
- Harvard University, Graduate School of Education: student guidance, 135
- Harvard University, Theological School: accrediting of students, 88; student guidance, 135
- History, place in early curriculum, 36
- Ideals, developing of, 159-62
- Illinois, University of, Library School: Armour Institute school becomes, 29; book selection, 48; emphasizes librarians' responsibilities, 50; summer courses, 56-57; grouping of courses, 84; second-year program, 102; program for advanced degrees, 103, 151; admission requirements, 139; aim, 156
- Information service, 21-22; *see also* Reference work
- Ingersoll, H. F., 45
- Inspection trips, 47
- Investigational procedures: in improving library work, 22-23; in forming curriculum, 67, 91; *see also* Research
- Jones, John Winter, 2
- Knowledge, imparting, 157
- Laboratory work, 123, 124-25
- Lambeck, Peter, 3
- Leadership: selection for, 117-18; training in other professions, 119
- Leonard, R. J., cited, 25, 149-50
- Liberal studies: in early schools, 33, 36; present need, 68-69; as curriculum extension, 108
- Librarians: history of work, 2-12; qualifications previous to 19th century, 3; growth of duties, 4, 5-6; handicaps in work, 11-12; definition of aims desirable, 13-14; responsibility for improved status of libraries, 20; need for utilization of all resources, 21; effects of improved status of libraries upon, 23-24; marginal responsibilities, 25-26
- Libraries: suggestions to improve status, 13-27; co-ordination among, 19-20; readjustment to constituencies, 20; *see also* Librarians; Library work
- Library Curriculum Study, 18, 23, 44-45
- Library extension, 19-20; in first curriculum, 53
- Library schools: sources of information concerning, 28; in other countries, 28-29; early schools, 29; aims, 29-30, 31, 32-33; length of term, 37; comparable agencies, 39-40; multiplication of, 41; Association of American Library Schools, 46; classification by Board of Education for Librarianship, 140-41, 145; influence of associated institutions, 144-45; non-teaching activities, 166-71; affiliations, 146-54; faculty, 174-78; ad-

- vancing of standards, 178-79; equipment, 179-80
- Library work: history, 1-12; comparison with other vocations, 11; growth under restrictions, 11-12; philosophy, 13-14; future of, 13-27; relation to other callings, 24-26; as a profession, 26-27; activities, 60-61; sources of information concerning, 90-91; enlarged view of, 92; survey for curriculum placement, 137
- Library Workers Association, 43
- Literature, place in early curriculum, 36
- London, University of, Institute of Education, student guidance, 135
- London, University of, School of Economics, student guidance, 134, 135
- London, University of, University College, School of Librarianship, 28
- Los Angeles Public Library, Library School: grouping of courses, 84; admission requirements, 139
- Louisiana State University, School of Library Science, on graduate basis, 140
- McGill University, Library School, elective scheme, 100
- Magliabecchi, Antonio, 2
- Mai, Cardinal, 5
- Mann, C. R., cited, 79
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology, honors system, 87
- Master's degree, 102, 103
- Mays, A. B., cited, 79
- Measuring as school function, 168-69
- Michigan, University of, Department of Library Science: liberal studies, 69; program for advanced degrees, 103, 151; admission requirements, 139
- Minnesota, University of, Division of Library Instruction, curriculum arrangement, 87
- Moscow, library school in, 28-29
- Naudé, Gabriel, 2
- New Jersey College for Women, Library School, elective scheme, 99
- New York Public Library, Library School: "senior" curriculum, 102-3; admission requirements, 139
- New York School of Social Work: seminars to integrate courses, 87; supervision of students, 126; student guidance, 134; field work, 177
- New York State College for Teachers: requirement for admission to Department of Librarianship, 139; spread of library study, 140
- New York State Library School: Columbia College Library School becomes, 29; early curriculum, 32, 35; book selection, 48; children's literature, 49; broadens aims, 50; "library extension," 53; community survey, 53; public speaking, 70; master's degree, 102; admission requirements, 139; faculty, 174-75
- Nicholas V, Pope, 2
- Non-resident study, 116; *see also* Correspondence study
- North Carolina, University of, School of Library Science, elective scheme, 99
- North Carolina College for Women, Department of Library Science, course in adolescent literature, 97
- Observation, 124, 125
- Organization of libraries: as activity of library work, 60; place in curriculum, 65; as extension to curriculum, 105; *see also* Administration of libraries
- Panizzi, Sir Antonio, 5
- Parentucelli, Tommaso (Thomas of Sarzana), 2
- Personnel: of the future, 23-25; direction a library activity, 61; study of problems, 65; effect of curriculum extensions on, 111-12; *see also* Admission requirements; Recruiting; Selection of students; Student guidance
- Placement, library schools as agencies, 170
- Platina, 3
- Plummer, M. W., cited, 47, 103, 165
- Pratt Institute, School of Library Science: founded, 29; early curriculum, 31, 32, 33, 35; early aims, 32; length of term, 37; book selection, 48-49; change in emphasis, 49; government publications, 53; classification of curriculum matter, 55; grouping of courses, 83; second-year program added, 102; normal course, 102;

- admission requirements, 138, 139;
- selection of faculty, 174
- "Problem students," 131
- Problems as form of work contact, 124, 125
- Professional education, "training" and "education," 155-56
- Professional schools: affiliations, 150-51; co-ordination in research, 152; over-full programs, 162-63; relation to their fields, 164
- Projects as form of work contact, 124, 125
- Proprietary libraries, 4-5
- Public libraries: growth after 1800, 4; part in development of library work, 6; duties in, 6-7; forms of municipal organization supporting, 10, 20; future service, 14-15; public administration of, 20; studies relating to, 106; library school affiliation, 147
- Putnam, Herbert, 5
- Readers' adviser, 115; course for "consulting librarians" at Columbia College, 53
- Recruiting, 167; selection for leadership, 117-18; *see also* Admission requirements; Personnel; Selection of students; Student guidance
- Reed, A. Z., cited, 150
- Reference work, 21-22; as subject of instruction, 63-64, 67; new emphasis, 93
- Research, 22-23, 104-7, 108, 109; *see also* Investigational procedures
- Russell, W. F., cited, 152
- Sacchi, Bartolomeo de (Platina), 3
- St. Catherine, College of, Library School, *see* College of St. Catherine, Library School
- St. Louis Library School: children's library work, 96-97; admission requirements, 139; suspension, 148
- School libraries: duties of librarian, 9; programs provided, 97; abridged curriculum, 114
- Selection of students, 167-68; *see also* Admission requirements
- Service load in library schools, 176-77
- Simmons College, School of Library Science: founded, 51; curriculum, 51, 52; experience requirements, 52; spread of study, 140
- Skills, teaching of, 158-59
- Sound records as library material, 14
- Special libraries: duties of librarian, 8; types, 10
- Specialized preparation, 117
- Spofford, A. R., 2
- Steffens, Lincoln, cited, 163
- Stone, C. H., 45
- Stratification, 16-17
- Student guidance, 122, 130-36
- Student qualifications, 111, 159, 182-86; *see also* Admission requirements; Selection of students
- Subscription libraries, 4-5
- Summer sessions in library methods, 39-40, 56-57
- Syracuse University, School of Library Science: practical emphasis, 51; elective scheme, 100; spread of study, 140
- Teachers: selection of, 31, 174-75; programs for, 102, 175, 178; supervision, 177-78
- Teachers' colleges, library school affiliation, 152-54
- Teaching: aims, 157; what constitutes good, 173-74; favorable conditions, 175-80; enrichment, 176-77; standards, 177-80
- Temporary Library Training Board, 42, 44
- Terminology, 18-19, 85, 90
- Thomas of Sarzana, 2
- Toronto, University of, Library School Canadian literature course, 54
- Training classes, 39, 55-56
- Training vs. education, 155-59
- Traits, influencing, 159-62
- Union Theological Seminary: seminars to integrate courses, 87; supervision of field work, 126
- Universities, library school affiliations, 147-52
- University libraries, *see* College libraries
- Van Praet, 2, 3
- Vocations: library work compared with other, 11; relation of library work to other, 24-26
- Washington, University of, School of Librarianship: general and technical

- subjects, 68-69; admission requirements, 139
- Western Reserve University, School of Library Science: founded, 51; curriculum, 51-52, 52-53, 96; grouping of courses, 84; admission requirements, 139
- Williamson, C. C.: report for Carnegie Corporation, 55; cited, 122
- Wisconsin, University of, Library School: "library extension," 53; grouping of courses, 84; admission requirements, 139
- Work contacts, analysis of, 123-25
- Yale University, Divinity School: curriculum building, 87; vocational group requirements, 100; student guidance, 134; faculty requirements, 175
- Yale University, Institute of Human Relations: co-ordination of research, 152; participation of faculties in, 177
- Yale University, School of Law: students' share in faculty projects, 109; ethics taught, 161
- Zenodotus, 5

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
STUDIES IN LIBRARY SERVICE

- I. Theory and History of Bibliography. By George Schneider.
Translated by Ralph Robert Shaw. xiv + 306 pages. \$3.75.
- II. Living with Books. By Helen E. Haines. xiv + 505 pages. \$4.00.
- III. Preparation for School Library Work. By Lucile F. Fargo.
xi + 190 pages. \$3.00.
- IV. The Curriculum in Library Schools. By Ernest J. Reece.
ix + 220 pages. \$3.00.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



124 108

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY